The
Homiletic and Pastoral Review
Vol. XXXIV MARCH, 1934 No. 6

Pastoralia

A Life of Fulfillments and Signs

From the beginning of human history, as the Biblical records testify, God announced to mankind the coming of a divine messenger, who was to be recognized by certain definite criteria. The fulfillment of all the details of the description in the life and character of Christ identify Him as the promised messenger. Since such foreknowledge of future events is an exclusive prerogative of God, the Messianic prophecies and their fulfillment constitute the testimony of the Heavenly Father in behalf of the divine mission of the Lord. Closer reading of the Old Testament prophecies tells us that God not only testified to the divine mission of Christ but also to His divine nature and personality. That the Jews did not recognize their Messiah, whom they were actually expecting precisely at the time when Christ really appeared, does not disprove the efficacy of the Father's testimony, but merely shows that they had formed a wrong picture of Him who was to come and thus were led into their tragic mistake. For us the argument from the fulfillment of prophecy is even stronger than it was for the contemporaries of the Lord, for we are in a better condition to perceive the spiritual meaning of certain passages which the Jews took in their literal sense. Besides, the prophecies relating to the Kingdom of Christ and His glorification on earth have since that time been verified in a manner that could not be anticipated by those living in an earlier age. What was ambiguous and bewildering before, becomes clear and unequivocal in retrospect. When we survey in our days the Kingdom of Christ, we quickly realize that the magnificent terms in which it is described by the prophets are no exaggeration but barely do justice to the reality. Israel may have dreamt of an empire like that of the Romans or Assyrians. but in

its most ardent hopes it never expected an empire conterminous with the boundaries of the earth such as the Church really is. In later historical developments the seeming contradictions of the prophecies have been harmonized, and it has become patent where the line between the spiritual and material is to be drawn. If the Jews had some excuse for not seeing, such excuse does not exist for us, for the accomplishment of the prophecies has removed all possibility of misinterpretation. Cardinal Newman explains the advantages which we have in this respect when he writes: "Announcements which could not be put forward in front of the argument, as being figurative, vague, or ambiguous, may be used validly and with great effect when they have been interpreted for us, first by the prophetic outline, and still more by the historical object. . . . In like manner the event is the true key to prophecy, and reconciles conflicting and divergent descriptions by embodying them in one common representative. Thus it is that we learn how, as the prophecies said, the Messiah could both suffer yet be victorious; His kingdom be Judaic in structure, yet evangelic in spirit; and His people the children of Abraham, yet sinners of the Gentiles. As to the Jews, since they lived before the event, it is not wonderful that, though they were right in their general interpretation of Scripture as far as it went, they stopped short of the whole truth; nay, that even when their Messiah came, they could not recognize Him as the promised King as we recognize Him now; for we have the experience of His history for nearly two thousand years, by which to interpret their Scriptures." [1]

The life of Christ was a life of marvellous fulfillments inasmuch as in its circumstances the predictions of the Jewish Scriptures referring to the Messiah were minutely verified. As mere coincidence does not explain this fact, the conclusion is justified that Christ was the subject of these prophecies—that is, the One whom the Heavenly Father wished to be known and recognized as His authentic messenger, for whose teaching He assumes the fullest responsibility. The fulfillment of the Messianic prophecies in Christ is the absolute guarantee that Christ has been sent by the Heavenly Father, and that He is what He claims to be. The evi-

[1] "An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent" (New York City).

dential value of fulfilled prophecy is indisputable, for prophecy can come only from God and has the full force of a seal that cannot be counterfeited. If God allowed a prophecy to confirm unwarranted claims, He would appear as the sponsor of falsehood, which is repugnant to His veracity. God cannot become privy to a fraud, but this would be the case if He permitted His omniscience to be abused for mendacious purposes. Prophecy inevitably makes God a personal witness to a fact, and such personal divine testimony offers an absolute guarantee of the truth. By the fulfillment of the Messianic prophecies in Christ the Father Himself introduced His Son to the world and gave mankind the fullest assurance of the divine mission of Jesus.

A Life of Signs

Not only was the coming of Christ announced to the world in a most extraordinary fashion, but His life itself here on earth was distinguished in many ways and lifted above the level of ordinary human existence. It was a life of signs, that is, a life directed in a special and unique manner by Divine Providence and crowded with striking manifestations of divine intervention. Seemingly trivial incidents are fraught with profound meaning and give evidence of a unifying purpose and governing design. At no point does this life "fade into the light of common day." The miraculous element abounds, and clings to the Lord with the same persistence as His shadow. The earthly career of the Lord was cast in an original mold and stamped with a hallmark that sets it aside from the lives of all other men. Even if, as St. Paul says, He was in all things made like unto man, in this very likeness there was a difference. We may sum up all the extraordinary circumstances of this life by stating that it was the life of God walking among men. A life which throughout revealed the hidden splendors of Divinity without overwhelming humanity by its dazzling glory. Miracles are an outstanding feature in this exceptional life which, while genuinely human, was always more than human.

When speaking of the self-disclosure of God, we must bear in mind that man, as a being deriving his knowledge through the avenues of the senses, cannot directly observe the Divine Nature. The manifestation of God accordingly must be made by means of

sensible signs which lead man to the recognition of things that transcend the senses. Signs will have to be chosen which, though facts perceived by the senses, are interpreted by reason as effects of an agency that surpasses all the powers of physical causality and therefore can be attributed only to God Himself. Wherever we find such a sign, we realize that God has directly intervened for some definite purpose, which we learn from the particular circumstances surrounding the situation. Thus, if such a sign occurs in connection with an assertion made or a claim advanced, we rightly conclude that God Himself assumes the part of a witness to the statement or guarantees the claim which has been put forth. The sign is the seal of divine authority.

The miracle is a sign of this type. Though it may have other purposes, its chief and most important aim is to serve as a criterion of supernatural revelation. The main function of the miracle, then, is to prove that a message comes from God. Authentic communications from heaven are accompanied by miracles vouching for the genuineness of the communication and establishing its divine origin. The evidential force of the miracle is incontestable, since it is a sign that cannot be imitated and hence cannot be turned to fraudulent use. We can say very aptly that a miracle is the divine signature endorsing a divine message or command. Now, the distinctive character of the divine signature is that it cannot be counterfeited, and consequently conveys absolute assurance under all circumstances. We know that this is not true of human signatures and seals, which are subject to falsification and accordingly can never afford absolute certainty. Under a human seal and signature a false message may be propagated, but no false message can be transmitted under the divine seal. The infallible character of the divine seal is well explained by Dr. Joseph J. Baierl in the following passage: "A king cannot accredit his envoy more certainly than by means of the royal seal. The whole proving force of the seal lies in the fact that it is a sign belonging exclusively to the king. So too, but in an infinitely higher sense, a miracle is the exclusive seal of the Deity, and therefore the authentic seal for the confirmation of a divine legate. The royal seal can lose its proving force only if a thief succeeds in stealing it, or a deceiver in counterfeiting it. But neither alternative is possible as regards the divine

power of working miracles. That power cannot be stolen from God, and there are sufficient criteria at hand to enable us to discern a counterfeit from a genuine miracle. The proving force of the seal stands in direct proportion to its exclusiveness." [2] Thus, a revelation sealed by miracles cannot but be authentic and genuine.

Unbelief and Miracles

Aversion to miracles is a trait common to disbelievers and rationalists. This aversion has the nature of an instinctive defense mechanism by which the infidel wishes to forestall the possibility of ever having to accept a divine revelation. It implies, however, also that even infidelity recognizes the evidential value that inheres in the miracle. The infidel does not wish to be convinced; he therefore rejects from the outset that which, if conceded, would prove most ruinous to his smug intellectual complacency. He protects himself by a mere prejudice. He closes his eyes to facts and refuses to investigate and examine. The bias of the unbeliever with regard to miracles is graphically described by Gilbert K. Chesterton, who compares the open-minded attitude of the believer to the fixed prepossessions of the infidel: "Somehow or other an extraordinary idea has arisen that the disbelievers in miracles consider them coldly and fairly, while believers in miracles accept them only in connection with some dogma. The fact is quite the other way. The believers in miracles accept them (rightly or wrongly) because they have evidence for them. The disbelievers in miracles deny them (rightly or wrongly) because they have a doctrine against them. . . . It is we Christians who accept all actual evidence—it is you rationalists who refuse actual evidence, being constrained to do so by your creed." [3] It is his dogma of materialism that forbids the unbeliever to admit the possibility of miracles and compels him to repudiate the historical evidence in their favor.

A miracle is an extraordinary effect in the world of human experience which cannot be attributed to natural causation but must be referred to a special and direct intervention of God Himself. The powers of nature have inherent limits; they are regulated by certain laws and pursue a uniform and constant course of operation. An

[2] "The Theory of Revelation" (Rochester, N. Y.).
[3] "Orthodoxy" (New York City).

occurrence disproportionate to the forces of nature and happening in a manner that does not conform to the laws governing physical phenomena cannot be explained on a natural basis, but must have its source in a power superior to the order of nature and independent of its laws. Such power is possessed only by the Creator, who is above nature and not bound or restricted in any way by its laws. He who denies the possibility of miracles either denies the existence of God or makes Him subject to the laws of the world which He has created. Chesterton is right when he states emphatically: "A miracle only means the liberty of God. . . . Scientific materialism binds God as the Apocalypse chained the devil. It leaves nothing free in the universe." [4] It would be absurd to say that God has no free hand in the universe which depends entirely on His will. "The possibility of miracles," writes Dr. J. Gresham Machen, "is indissolubly joined with theism. Once admit the existence of a personal God, Maker and Ruler of the world, and no limits, temporal or otherwise, can be set to the creative power of such a God. Admit that God once created the world, and you cannot deny that He might engage in creation again." [5] True, the world is a well-regulated and well-ordered system, but that is far from saying that it constitutes a rigid mechanism which does not leave even to the Almighty the smallest margin of freedom.

Less radical is the position of those who assert that, though miracles are possible if we consider them in relation to the absolute power of God, they are repugnant to His wisdom. It is argued that only a God of caprice would interfere with the uniform course of nature which He Himself has established. Undoubtedly arbitrary interference with the order of nature would be unworthy of God, but we must bear in mind that in the divine cosmic scheme the material exists for the sake of the spiritual and the physical is subordinated to the moral. It involves no incongruity if God, in order to realize a spiritual and higher purpose, sets aside the laws of the natural order. A great moral object which cannot be obtained by the instrumentality of the order of nature is a sufficient motive to warrant an interruption of this order.

Neither do miracles destroy the uniformity and stability of phy-

[4] *Op. cit.*
[5] "Christianity and Liberalism" (New York City).

sical laws or render a reliable knowledge of these laws impossible. They occur only as exceptions, and consequently really emphasize the permanence and regularity of law in nature. Moreover, when a miracle is wrought, the higher purpose of God is also manifested and the witnesses in some manner are warned that a supernatural event is about to take place. If scientific prediction in case of a miraculous event is foiled, it is because the scientist stubbornly insists on the absolute character of natural laws, and refuses to take into account the larger situation which contains as an essential factor the free agency of God. Hence, in spite of the occurrence of miracles science can be fully trusted within its limits and the orderly and normal arrangement of our lives is in no way disturbed.

Unbelief is loath to surrender its position and therefore continues in its objections. Miracles, it now claims, even if they did happen, could not be known as such, since we are ignorant of the full scope of nature's powers. It is quite true that we have no adequate positive knowledge of the extent of nature's forces, but we can with certainty assign definite negative limits to physical causality. Though we are unable to say what nature can do, we are able to say what nature cannot do. Wherever an effect supposing creative activity is involved, we may confidently rule out natural causation. Likewise, where the manner according to which nature works is not observed, we must appeal to a higher causality which transcends nature's mode of operation. Not always is it possible to assert the miraculous character of an occurrence; in that case prudence and honesty forbid us to pretend to a certainty which we do not possess. But if there are instances in which the question must remain undecided, there are others in which the supernatural character of the event is beyond all doubt. An easily recognizable criterion of a genuine miracle is the manifest disproportion between the means employed and the effect produced. The miracle is usually produced without any elaborate preparation or special technique, without any careful setting of the stage (as in the case of a magician's performance or spiritistic seance) and without appropriate instruments, but merely by a simple word or a prayer. In most cases it possesses features and occurs under circumstances which unequivocally mark it as an extraordinary and supernatural event. We agree that miracles must not be lightly asserted, and that the

supernatural character of an event should only be admitted after careful and critical investigation.

The particular miracles to which we refer as credentials of the Christian revelation do not come under our immediate observation, but are accepted on the strength of historical testimony. Here the unbeliever takes his last stand, declaring that historical evidence can never be sufficient to guarantee the actual occurrence of a miraculous event in the past. This claim is arbitrary. Unquestionably, the testimony given in favor of an alleged miracle must be subjected to the rules of historical criticism, and, since the event to be established is of an extraordinary quality, we are justified in applying these rules in a more rigorous manner than would be done where less important matters are concerned. But if after proper examination it becomes evident that the historical testimony affirming the miraculous fact is in every respect trustworthy and reliable, it would be unreasonable to reject the evidence merely because it does attest a fact of extraordinary character. Unless we wish to invalidate all human testimony and thereby render historical knowledge impossible, we cannot, if it is otherwise satisfactory from the standpoint of historical criticism, deny its value only on account of its content. Historical evidence can be of such weight and unimpeachable character that it affords genuine certainty even with regard to facts of rare occurrence and exceptional nature. The only thing that no amount of testimony could make plausible and credible is the metaphysically impossible, but we have seen that miracles, though infrequent experiences, are not impossible and have their legitimate place in a world ruled by a Supreme Intelligence.

We have previously proved that the Gospels are reliable historical records. They do attribute to Our Lord works of a supernatural character that cannot be denied. To these works Christ Himself appealed as credentials of His divine mission and in confirmation of His teaching and His claims. These works were admitted by His enemies and caused them the greatest embarrassment: "The chief priests, therefore, and the Pharisees gathered a council and said: 'What do we, for this man doth many miracles? If we let him alone so, all will believe in him.' "[6] The early intellectual op-

[6] John, xi 47, 48.

ponents of Christianity (among them Celsus) did not dispute the facts but tried to explain them on natural grounds. Thus Origen says: "Celsus, moreover, unable to resist the miracles which Jesus is reported to have performed, has already on several occasions spoken of them slanderously as works of sorcery." [7] Modern unbelief adopts a similar policy and endeavors to reduce the happenings (the historicity of which cannot be called into doubt) to the level of natural causality. We shall find that such attempts at evasion are futile, and that the works of Christ are truly miraculous in character. If so, they must be viewed as unmistakable signs by which the Heavenly Father authenticates the mission of Christ and guarantees the truth of His teaching and claims.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

[7] *Contra Celsum.*

DIVI THOMÆ SERMONES FESTIVI

By the Right Rev. Msgr. H. T. Henry, Litt.D.

How well known or how easily accessible may now be the Angelic Doctor's "Sermones pro Dominicis diebus et pro Sanctorum solemnitatibus," is perhaps a matter of divided opinion. Sixty years ago Hurter, in the Preface to his edition of them, considered them "sat rari" in his own days, noting that the previous editions were in 1570, 1571, 1578, 1618—the first two at Rome, the other two at Paris and Mainz respectively. There was a long interval between 1618 and the appearance of his own edition at Innsbruck in 1874.[1] This fact suggested his own editorial work in order that they might be available to theologians in general; but he adds: "Eoque libentius consilium hoc inii, quod mox celebraturi sumus sextum festum seculare mortis piissimæ tanti doctoris," and places a footnote here: "Obiit enim 7. Martii 1274."

In respect of all this excellent information, I may be permitted to record a personal point of view. Hurter's little volume came into my hands two years ago in quite a casual manner. Reading the *Præfatio,* however, I was less interested in his purpose of publishing the *Sermones* ("in communem theologorum utilitatem") than in his later declaration: "ut ergo in omnibus excitetur grata angelici doctoris memoria, juverit eum non solum e cathedris docentem sed et concionantem fragentemque panem parvulis audire." Hurter evidently thought that such a volume would inure to the benefit of preachers in ordinary parish houses as well as of teachers of theology in seminaries and universities. It is in this respect that his volume appeals to me with peculiar force, and especially for the uses of the present series of papers on panegyrics of the Saints. Accordingly, only those of the *Sermones* that treat of the Saints will be considered here. Also, since there is a most abundant store of sermons dealing with Our Lady and her many

[1] In order to discriminate this volume from other *Sermones* and *Conciones* of St. Thomas, I give the title-page in full: "Divi Thomæ Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici Sermones pro Dominicis diebus et pro Sanctorum solemnitatibus edidit H. Hurter, S. Theol. et Philos. Doctor, ejusdem S. Theol. in C. R. Univers. Oenipont. Professor P. O. Cum approbatione celsissimi Episcopi Brixinensis et Facultate Superiorum. Oeniponte 1874 (Litteris et sumptibus librariæ Societatis Marianæ)." Hurter notes that the genuineness of these *sermones* is not "supra omne dubium," admits that they may be condensations of sermons preached by the Saint, but contends nevertheless for their correct ascription to St. Thomas.

glorious feasts, I shall not attempt to carry coals to Newcastle. I cannot wait for the seventh centenary of the Angelic Doctor's death, and I have therefore planned only to have this paper published in his month of March as a very feeble tribute of reverence to the great Saint and Doctor of the Church.

I

It will be liturgically interesting to note here the feasts of Saints in the little volume of *Sermones.* The insertion of a (2) after a feast will serve to indicate that there are two *sermones* for that feast. Omitting feasts of Our Lord and Our Lady, we find the following feasts (in the order in which they occur): St. Stephen, Protomartyr; St. John Evangelist (2); Holy Innocents; St. Thomas (2); St. Silvester (2); Sts. Fabian and Sebastian (2); St. Agens (2); St. Vincent (2); Conversion of St. Paul; St. Agatha (2); Cathedra S. Petri; St. Matthias; St. Gregory; St. Benedict (2); St. Ambrose (2); St. George; St. Mark (2); S. Joannis ante portam Lat.; St. Barnabas; St. John Baptist; Sts. John and Paul; Sts. Peter and Paul; Commemoration of St. Paul; St. Margaret; St. Mary Magdalen; St. James; S. Petri ad vincula; St. Dominic; St. Lawrence; St. Bernard; St. Bartholomew; St. Augustine; Decollatio S. Joannis Bapt.; St. Matthew; St. Michael (2); St. Francis; St. Dionysius (2); St. Luke; Sts. Simon and Jude; All Saints; St. Martin; St. Cecilia; St. Clement; St. Catharine; St. Andrew (2); St. Nicholas; St. Lucy; St. Thomas, Apostle.

These *sermones* are not sermons in our use of the word, but are very brief sketches or plans of sermons. Hurter begins his Preface by declaring that learned men had often advised him of their notable value, and that his own reading of them had stimulated him to edit them anew. He further notes that in the time of St. Thomas some of the feasts and Sundays had not the same Gospel and Epistle pericopes as we now have; that some of the Scripture texts are not given literally but merely in their meaning or according to incorrect manuscripts of the Scriptures; and that Hurter himself has corrected some erroneous attributions of authorship. With these slight limitations borne in mind, the *Sermones Festivi* teach us a number of valuable lessons for the planning of discourses on the Saints. Meanwhile, the little volume so carefully edited by

Hurter may still be rather a rare book. At any rate, I confess to having passed two score years in the priesthood before becoming aware of its existence. Perhaps some of my readers will have shared this nescience, and may accordingly find it both interesting and helpful to have some of these lessons pointed out here. We may begin with St. George, whose cult offers a panegyrical difficulty.

II

St. George (April 23) has been, and still is, a very popular Saint.[2] In 1852, John Henry Newman preached his great sermon on the Second Spring before the Hierarchy of England, and referred to St. Ignatius Loyola as "the St. George of the modern world, with his chivalrous lance run through the writhing foe." Of course, neither Newman nor any one of his cultivated hearers believed in the myth or legend of St. George and the Dragon. It was enough that the popular legend had found expression in works of art as well as of letters, and could thus furnish the preacher with a poetical reference (couched meanwhile in Newman's highly rhythmical prose) without any implication of belief in the myth. But may we imitate his example in this matter without misleading many of our hearers? Should we not preferably mention the legend only to discredit it, lest our hearers should go away with a poor idea of our general information as well as of our mentality?

Again, writing for English readers, we find Cardinal Wiseman picturing the patriotic inspiration of St. George in medieval England: "If the war-cry of 'St. George for England,' ringing inspiringly through the English ranks, cheered on our mailed barons to the charge, and nerved the arms of our cross-bowmen to speed their shafts, the same watchword excited the pious devotion of peaceful citizens at home, filled all the churches with ardent votaries,

[2] The April volume of Butler's "Lives of the Saints" (New Edition, "corrected, amplified and edited" by Herbert Thurston, S. J., and Norah Leeson) remarks in its text on St. George, page 265: "There is every reason to believe that St. George was a real martyr who suffered at Diospolis (*i.e.*, Lydda) in Palestine, probably before the time of Constantine. Beyond this there seems to be nothing which can be affirmed with any confidence." The bibliographical note (page 266) illustrates the present large literary and learned output on the Saint, including "St. George of Lydda" (1930) by Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, as illustrating learned investigations, and "St. George the Martyr" (1915) by G. F. Hill and "Saint George of England" (1929) by G. J. Marcus, as illustrating "the more popular aspects of the subject." The last-named work may remind us of Bulley's "St. George for Merrie England" (1908).

thronged the village greens throughout the land with candidates for rustic honors, and united king and people in one prayer for the welfare of their country." Meanwhile, St. George was not the patron of England alone, although the Cardinal's hearers or readers might easily have though so. Churches in honor of the Saint are spread throughout Christendom, and he was an object even of Moslem reverence. He was practically the Patron Saint of Syrian Catholics. He was also Patron Saint of many medieval orders of chivalry and of modern military or patriotic or religious associations. He belongs virtually to all Christian nations or peoples. Scholars, of course, recognize this as a fact. Thus, John R. Fryar, himself an Englishman, remarks in his article on Religious Military Orders: "St. George early became the tutelary saint of many nations. The Greeks call him the 'Great Martyr,' and solemnly observe his day. The Georgians take their name from him. Genoa honors him as a patron saint, and from him the soldier draws inspiration to courage and patriotism in war; and to honor and defend the weaker sex in society." So, too, Chambers's "Book of Days" tells us that "Sicily, Aragon, Valencia, Genoa, Malta, Barcelona, looked up to him as their guardian saint; and as to knightly orders bearing his name, a Venetian Order of St. George was created in 1200, a Spanish in 1317, an Austrian in 1470, a Genoese in 1472, to say nothing of the more modern ones in Bavaria (1792), Russia (1767), and Hanover (1839)." Again, writing about Lydda in Palestine, George Adam Smith, in his "Historical Geography of the Holy Land," remarks: "The chief interest of Lydda centers around her St. George. There is no hero whom we shall more frequently meet in Palestine. Indeed, among all the saints there has been none with a history like this one, who, from obscure origins, became . . . patron as well of the most Western of all Christian peoples. St. George of Lydda is St. George of England. . . . " Identifying England with what he calls "the most Western of all Christian peoples," the writer seems to have forgotten the land whose ancient name described it as peculiarly and ultimately "the western land," and whose great Patronal Saint is not St. George but St. Patrick. And perhaps we of a still more Western land may be slightly irked by the (unconscious, of course) omission of America from the list of "Christian peoples."

Meanwhile, what is really known about our Saint can be told in very few words, although what can and has been said about him has filled many volumes, because legend has been most busy with the Saint. But the Christian pulpit is the Throne of Truth. A previous paper has quoted the careful and wholly reverent words of Newman, written on the eve of his entrance into the Church, on this very matter. It might, on occasion, be desirable for a preacher to quote his words, to allude to the fabulous and legendary character of much that has been collected on the career of the Saint and to Gibbon's sneering remarks thereupon, and then to give the good reasons we have for accepting the few facts known about St. George as witnessed to by the ancient churches and inscriptions honoring his memory.

All this, however, whilst enlightening and (if told with discrimination) sufficiently proper, can be dispatched in a few minutes. What, then, becomes of our patronal panegyric? Must it be a discourse of ten minutes' duration? Perhaps the sketch or plan devised by St. Thomas will help us? He says nothing directly about the Saint whose feast is being celebrated, but simply comments upon his text. The plan can be illustrated by quoting here the first half of his sketch or plan:

> *Si quis vult venire post me, abneget semetipsum etc.* Lucæ 9, 23. Duo facit Dominus in his verbis. Primo ad eundum post se invitat; secundo, quæ sunt necessaria ad hoc, demonstrat.
>
> Circa primum est euntium post eum paucitas; secundum arbitrii libertas; tertium magna Domini bonitas. Primum ibi, *Si quis;* quasi dicat, rarus est, qui velit. Bernardus: "Quam pauci sunt, Domine Jesu, qui post te venire velint! quamquam nonnulli, qui ad te venire velint." Secundum ibi, *Tollat;* quasi dicat, in voluntate hominis est ire et non ire; quia si facit, quod in se est, habilitando se, Deus facit, quod in se est, gratiam infundendo. Eccli. 15, 17: *Apposuit tibi bonum et malum etc.* Tertium ibi, *Post me.* Magna prorsus bonitas, quia omnes voluit facere de familia sua et post se ducere. Joan 6, 37: *Eum qui venerit ad me, non ejiciam foras:* Non sic reges et principes mundi.
>
> Circa secundum sciendum, quod tria sunt necessaria euntibus post Christum. Primum est propriæ voluntatis abnegatio; secundum carnis mortificatio; tertium Christi imitatio. Primum ibi, *Abneget semetipsum,* id est propriam voluntatem; secundum ibi, *Tollat crucem suam,* id est carnis mortificationem; tertium ibi, *Sequatur me.*

The sketch concludes with "Rogemus etc." This obviously is meant as both application and exhortation. Previous sketches have: "Rogemus ergo" and "Rogemus ergo Dominum etc." While no direct reference is made to St. George, the implications of the sketch are sufficiently evident.

The Angelic Doctor has furnished us with a model for discourses on Patronal Saints concerning whom we have little authentic information. If, in succeeding years, we desire some variety in our preaching, we may consult Father Drinkwater's volume, "Two Hundred Sermon Notes" (London and St. Louis, 1928, page 235), for a sketch on St. George that says nothing directly about the Saint, but comments on the Gospel of the feast, not in the First Form of the Homily, but simply taking some suggestive lines from the pericope. This is quite different in manner from the method of St. Thomas, and can be illustrated by excerpting about one-third of the sketch:

> 1. *"I am the true Vine."* The Incarnation as a vital, slow-growing, fruit-bearing enterprise.
> 2. *"My Father the husbandman."* History, especially church history, unrolls itself under God's fostering care: so every reason for faith, and none for worry.
> 3. *"He will take away"*—most terrible fate, to be given up as a failure even by God. So again in verse 6.
> 4. *"He will purge it"*—here is the explanation of the sufferings of the Church, martyrdoms especially; and of all pain in this life.

There are eight points, the eighth asking us to "remember that the Church uses this Gospel for the feast of Martyrs!" And thus does the heroism of St. George come home to the hearers by suggestion or implication, although the sermon does not mention him at all.

Further variety can be found in Bishop Bonomelli's homilies on the Common of Saints. In the case of St. George, or of any other martyr, the great number of common offices for one or more martyrs, in and out of paschal time, afford wide fields for beautiful and inspiring comment. But the panegyrist is not limited to the Gospels or Epistles. Any part of the Proper could be used; or of the psalms, hymns, versicles, responsories, of the Breviary. The hymns, in particular, could offer a pleasant and withal an instructive kind of variety. Dom Britt's volume, "The Hymns of the

Breviary and Missal," gives us versified, as well as literal, translation and comments.

The Angelic Doctor's treatment of Saints whose biographies are more trustworthy is pleasantly varied in character. On occasion, he plays on the mere name of a saint. Thus with St. Stephen: "Stephanus interpretatur coronatus: et dignus fuit ut tali vocaretur nomine, qui primo meruit corona martyrii coronari." Then he proceeds to speak of the four kinds of crowns that circle the brows of the Saints: silver, starry, golden, jewelled—and for each of the four he has a scriptural quotation for exposition. Thus with St. Vincent, "Vincenti dabo edere de ligno vitæ" is the text he chooses (Apoc., xii. 7); and he remarks that "beatus Vincentius fuit secundum nomen suum vincens triplex bellum, scilicet hostile, civile et intestinum." Thus, with St. Margaret, "Inventa una pretiosa margarita, etc." (Matt., xiii. 46) is his text.

For St. Martin he chooses a text suggested by the Saint's life as soldier, monk, bishop: "Scidi pallium meum, evulsi capillos et barbam, et sedi mœrens" (Esdr., ix. 3), and begins: "Hæc verba possunt exponi de beato Martino: et notantur hic tria quæ fecit in triplici statu, scilicet in statu militis, in statu monachi et in statu Episcopi: fuit enim miles, monachus et Episcopus. Miles pallium scidit ad litteram et pauperi nudo dedit. Isai. 58, 7: *Cum videris nudum, operi eum.* Monachus capillos evulsit, id est temporalia reliquit, quæ per capillos designantur. . . ." Similarly for St. Ambrose he chooses as text, "Ecce examen apum erat in ore leonis et favus mellis" (Jud., xiv. 18), and divides it into three parts: "Primo miraculosa apum in ore ejus apparitio. . . . Ad litteram, quando jacebat in cunabulis, venit examen apum et intravit in os ejus, etc."

It might prove tedious to give further illustration of the Saint's desire for variety in treatment. And I do not suggest that preachers of today should servilely imitate[3] his methods of achieving this desirable variety. But other expedients can be employed to this end.

---

[3] One example of the danger of servile imitation is furnished by the sermon on St. Thomas the Apostle. The text is: *"Dedit abyssus vocem suam; altitudo manus suas levavit.* Habacuc 3, 10. Possunt hæc verba exponi de beato Thoma. . . . Abyssus dicitur Thoma propter tria. Primo, propter nominis rationem . . . quia Thomas interpretatur abyssus. Propter etymologiæ significationem, quia abyssus dicitur ab *a*, quod est sine, et *byssus*, quod est pannus candidus. . . ."

RETREATS FOR BOYS

By Kilian J. Hennrich, O.M.Cap., M.A.

The tremendous changes in our social, economic, industrial, home and family life have not remained without influence upon the religious life of children as well as of adults. It is with boys we are concerned at present, although much of what will be proposed applies equally well to girls. The last forty years have taken much away from the life of boys, spiritually as well as physically, and have added much that is not profitable to Christian living. Confining ourselves to such changes that relate to spiritual life, we recall a tremendous increase in leisure time, a steady increase in the visits to the cinema, the growth of doubtful commercial recreation—and as an ominous symptom the lowering of the average age of young delinquents. To this may be added the application of wrong principles by endeavoring to graft religion upon neutral recreational movements instead of adding some suitable recreation to church organizations. In consequence of this, many once flourishing sodalities—Junior Holy Name and other parish societies—have practically ceased to exist, or do no longer exercise their erstwhile salutary influence. Even the return to the old discipline of the Church has brought, together with numerous blessings, new and more or less serious problems. Very early Communion and Confirmation have led to the discontinuation of the impressive solemnity and preparation that formerly preceded the reception of these Sacraments just before adolescence. The early reception of these Sacraments has in many instances withdrawn boys at an early age from Sunday school and, in consequence, from the supervision of the clergy. This becomes more serious, if we keep in mind that the majority of our children do not attend parochial schools. Turning from youth to adults, we notice that an intensity in Catholic life is growing wherever the retreat movement is well organized. It is in retreats that the spirit of Catholic Action is inflamed.

This being the case, it is but natural that zealous priests, here and abroad, conceived the idea that what was good for adults might also be suitable to rekindle the spirituality of the young. A trial was made and reports that reach us from Europe give suf-

ficient hope that retreats for boys might be equally useful in our country, not only in educational institutions but also in the parishes. These retreats differ somewhat from those given to adults. Their main object is to keep good what is good and to make it still better. Conversion is not primarily intended, but a deepening of spirituality and an enthusiasm for and perseverance in virtue. Both forms of retreats—open and closed—may be utilized, much depending on circumstances and available facilities. It does not matter much whether they are called retreats, spiritual exercises, rallies, triduums or any other name, as long as the word "mission" is reserved for the more serious religious awakenings or revivals.

Occasion for a Retreat

Besides the general objects mentioned, a boys' retreat should have a specific object growing out of the occasion. There ought to be a special incentive for taking part in the exercises, and, therefore, the retreat should be connected with a day or event that will arouse interest and enthusiasm. In other words, retreats should be held on a proper occasion and should have an inspiring purpose. Suitable occasions would be, for example, graduation from grammar and high school, the celebration of a patron feast, the close or beginning of the St. Aloysius Sundays, a preparation for the feast of the Immaculate Conception or Lent, etc. It is important to select a time when other pastoral work is not too pressing. Whether the time during which adult retreats or missions are held in a parish is suitable for children's retreats, is debatable. It seems that at present, owing to the practice of urging the faithful to receive Communion daily, the time required for the confessional does not leave the missionary sufficient leisure to take due care of the spiritual needs of children unless a special missionary has been secured for this purpose. The week preceding the mission for adults is undoubtedly more suitable, and will provide an opportunity to give three days to boys and three to girls.

Serious thought might be given to the feasibility of having spiritual exercises conducted as a preparation for the Sacrament of Confirmation. It would contribute much to emphasizing the very important place this Sacrament holds permanently in Christian life. A higher concept of its nature and scope is very desirable.

Special occasions for a boy's retreat may be, for example, the establishment of a religious society or its renewal in spirit or membership, the start of concerted action in promoting beneficial exercises or removing evil influences from the parish; a retreat may also serve as a remote preparation for preparing boys to coöperate in increasing the attendance at adult missions, to arouse interest in the foreign missions or other religious endeavor, or to impart special guidance.

Duration and Place of Retreat

The duration of a boys' retreat depends much on the circumstances of the place where it is held and whether it is an open or a closed retreat. Open retreats—those during which the boys reside at home and assemble for spiritual exercises only—should not be attempted for less than three days, for the simple reasons that a concentrated hour plan is almost impossible and because it takes considerable time to get boys into the right disposition. For closed retreats, during which boys are segregated, two days or even one might be utilized if a longer period cannot be arranged. But not every segregation is conducive to the success of a retreat. The location is of great importance. Its associations must exercise a psychological influence for good. A stay in a monastery, convent, seminary or school would be such an influence, because these places and their surroundings and inhabitants suggest order, piety, worship, religion, education, etc. A few hours' stay will undoubtedly ensure the proper disposition and its maintenance. It is an entirely different matter with summer camps, resorts or similar accommodations. These are associated with freedom, boisterousness, physical exercises, pleasure, nakedness, not to mention moral implications. In such surroundings it takes too long to establish the right disposition, and it is extremely difficult to maintain a receptive mood. A short retreat camping trip would seem not only psychologically unsound but also doubtful of permanent results. Does this mean that camps should not be utilized for giving retreats to boys? No! There is a difference between a camping retreat and a retreat in a camp. In the first case, the camping trip is arranged for the purpose of giving a retreat, the camping feature serving as an attraction and the camping activities being upper-

most in the mind of the boys intending to attend. In the second case, the time the boys spend at camp is partly utilized for giving them a retreat—usually and more profitably after they have been at camp for some time and are about to leave. By that time the novelty of nature life has worn off, and the camping activities may be reduced to give time for spiritual work without causing resentment that would impair the fruitfulness of the exercises. Some kind of retirement from worldly engagements is always required for a good retreat. The very name implies this. "Non in commotione Dominus." As a last resort, when nothing else is possible or practical, one-day retreat outings have been recommended or short-week ends, with the retreat and not the outing emphasized—the outing being intended to provide some kind of retirement rather than as a "joy trip." But since little has been done or heard about this practice, its value cannot well be determined at the present stage of the experiment.[1]

Closed Retreats

The closed retreats are undoubtedly the most effective and therefore the more desirable, although they bring with them the problem of providing suitable accommodations, including food and shelter, if held outside educational institutions. They also require some outlay. To provide the latter, European groups have started a savings system by which the cost of the annual closed retreat is distributed over the entire year in the form of monthly dues or weekly contributions. In some parishes an extra collection is taken up in order to make the attendance of poor children possible. If a demand for closed boys' retreats has once been created, the means to satisfy it will soon be provided. Religious vacation schools might be considered as one.

Before considering the topics for boys' retreat conferences and their presentation, a few technical questions may be considered. Regarding the keeping of silence, opinions and practice differ. Some demand strict silence, others do not even mention it. The best rule seems to be to prohibit all unnecessary talking, and insist on the observance of this prohibition. The same variety of opinions prevails with regard to games. Some retreat masters permit them

[1] See "Children's Retreat," in *The Acolyte* (July 30, 1927).

as a means to refresh mind and body; others prohibit them as destroying interior recollection. Both seemingly have good reasons for their attitude. However, walks and religious songs might serve as substitutes. They also refresh mind and body and do not fill the mind with thoughts and ideas that are inconsistent with interior peace and recollection. Of great importance is a practical hour plan. Many short exercises followed by short periods of relaxation seem to be preferable to fewer and longer instructions, conferences and prayers. All prayers, including the regular daily prayers, should be said in common. In appointing the time for meditations and the examination of conscience, the age of the retreatants should be considered. Not less than ten hours of sleep should be provided, and the table reading, if any, should be an interesting and appropriate story. Stories that can be read in about thirty minutes or less will be more appreciated than whole books that cannot be finished before the end of the retreat—no matter how interesting these latter may be.

Topics for Conferences

So far the "Why?" and "When?" of boys' retreats have been discussed. Equally important is the question: "What matter should be presented and how?"

Keeping in mind the general object of the retreat (which is to keep what is good and to improve it), the retreat master should exercise a threefold guidance. First, he should guide from a natural to a supernatural view of life, stressing loyalty to Christ, the Church and Faith. Secondly, he should guide to the exercise of a practical Christian life: Prayer, Sacraments, and, if desired, religious societies and other means. Thirdly, he should guide to moral strength (character), to virtue in general and to the virtues of the boy's state of life in particular, advising means to avoid or conquer temptations. This threefold guidance will emphasize the value of religion for the present and future life, and will promote its exercise and manifestation. It will call attention to the enemies of religion and morality, especially to the dangers associated with idleness, lukewarmness, bad reading, the screen, radio, bad company and improper amusements. It will bring out plastically and

in a practical manner what it means to be a child of God and a knight of Mary.

The success of a retreat depends upon reaching the mind and the heart of the boys, principally the latter. This a retreat master will not fully accomplish unless he has some definite knowledge of the psychology of present-day boyhood. It is true that natural talent and ability are great helps, and that supernatural grace is the most powerful influence; nevertheless, the retreat master can utilize with profit the reliable researches of modern science.

As far as the psychology of religion is concerned, three more or less distinct periods in the mental, emotional and physical life of boys may be observed. The special characteristics of these periods should determine the selection, treatment and presentation of the topics for instruction. The knowledge of the interests and likings found to predominate at a certain age will assist to elicit and to retain attention. Although these three periods are not always chronologically exactly the same with all individuals, their sequence and occurrence around the time given is well established.

First Period.—Boys under 11 years of age, mentally considered, need fundamental instructions. As a rule, they know little or nothing about the truths necessary for salvation. With them nothing can be presupposed. Generally speaking, the Catholic home no longer imparts religious information by pious practices, prayer and reading. The instructions must be positive (not apologetic), and applications must be made to actual every-day situations and practical problems. Emotionally these boys are highstrung and easily led one way or another. The emotions influence the intellect and its decisions to a great extent. Inspirational presentation captures head and heart and is seemingly the best and most effective. Physically, these boys are robust and they do not bother about the future; even death and hell leave them cold because they are too far distant. They are very active, and hence have no time for serious sex matters. They admire active religion and like to take part in public prayer, singing and processions. During this period of life stress should be laid on the virtue of modesty (shame).[2] As far as their interests are concerned, they love to hear or read stories

[2] See "Seraphic Youth Companion," Ch. II.

from the Bible, about Saints and heroes. They desire to accomplish, advance, possess and show their prowess. On the other hand, they show but little interest in and understanding for spirituality. With them, animalism still prevails.

Second Period.—Boys between the age of 11 and 14 years need simple but more advanced instructions. They desire to learn more about religion, and their mental attitude is inquisitive. They begin to take interest in abstract truths if interestingly presented. Boys of this age are probably capable of drawing their own conclusions, but are still slow in applying principles to their own life. Emotionally they become more steady. Altruism, and with it, an understanding of the necessity of practising virtues, grows. At this time simple life principles or conduct rules are formed and accepted, and these often become the foundation for a future vocation. These boys are still easily led, are devout, and are capable of great religious enthusiasm. Physically, a more rapid development of the body brings with it sexual changes and manifestations that arouse curiosity and may cause serious temptations. Auto-eroticism is frequently inaugurated at this time, and a desire to see and learn something about the genitals, their functions and mechanics becomes stronger. On the other hand, their sense of shame deepens; they appear to be more sensitive and, as a rule, abhor the companionship of girls whom they consider quite inferior to boys, and therefore cease to play with them. Association with gangs, teams, clubs and other recreational units takes its place. The boy's interests develop strongly at this age. He wishes success, recognition and a good career without bothering much about the means to attain it. He loves strenuous exercises, contests and sports. He is a rowdy, but makes attempts to be manly and sometimes succeeds. Detective and exploration stories and games fascinate him.

Third Period.—Boys between 14 and 18 years of age often start to doubt religious truths and gradually become skeptical. They want proofs, and manifest interest in apologetical talks. At the same time, true spirituality slowly develops and religion begins to have a new meaning in practical life. Mysteries are inquired into and conclusions are drawn and applied to personal life. These boys require a strong appeal in order to persuade them that the only right thing to do is to do what is right. Emotionally, boys of this

age are more quiet. Their ardent devotion cools considerably, and with it indifference to religion and its exercises increases. They become reticent and shy, and rarely bare their soul to anyone. Without some stimulation they will not even consult a confessor, and they have a great aversion to being much questioned about their private affairs. All unpleasant experiences worry them greatly and often for a considerable time, and the condition remains unnoticed except, perhaps, by their most intimate companions. These boys require great sympathy and evidence of being fully understood. Physically, they have acquired puberty, and with it sex temptation grows more frequent and more violent. At first, sex phenomena disturb them, but, unless counteracted, they grow accustomed to the experience and gradually they become addicted to vices that are difficult to eradicate. Towards the end of the period, most boys living in the world make an approach to the other sex. They love to be well formed and well dressed, and lay great stress on personal appearance. But they hate to arouse attention or to appear different from other boys. In their activities and exercises they often become reckless, especially if records can be made.

The interests of late adolescents become more varied. They frequently engage in much and indiscriminate reading, looking for all kinds of information. Extreme and radical measures appeal to them, especially in politics and economics. Hence, they easily follow radical leaders. They want immediate results in everything they attempt. They also manifest great interest in occupational activities, collections and mechanical work. Although capable of forming true friendships, their circle of confidants grows smaller. Towards the end of the period a desire for social activities, dances, shows and parties manifests itself. The habit of smoking and drinking is often initiated at this time. With boys over 18 years we are not concerned at present.[3]

If it happens that a retreat master must speak to boys of different age levels, he will do well in selecting the second period as his basis, unless one of the others markedly predominates. The general tone and quality of all instructions for boys should be positive and direct but emotional; authoritative and plain but sympathetic. They

[3] See "New Life," Chapter VII.

should not be too long nor too short; about 20 to 30 minutes will suit them best.

The guidance of adolescents is a wide field embracing religious, social and occupational guidance, all of which is contained in the one term, "vocational guidance." Is there any need to enter into some phases of vocational guidance during a retreat? Undoubtedly this will have a prominent place in Graduation Retreats. But much earlier boys should not only be informed about their general calling or vocation to the Kingdom of Heaven, but also about the different roads to get there or the special states of life that may be entered to assure their salvation. The priesthood, sisterhoods and brotherhoods do not perpetuate themselves like the natural family. The recruiting of new members depends on calling attention to the vocations—what they are and require, how they may be reached, and what will aid in preserving and fostering them. Biological urge will lead many into the married state. This is the physical and emotional aspect, but matrimony is essentially religious, being initiated by a Sacrament. Christian families must be built on a solid foundation laid in early youth. Guidance in this matter insists upon purity of life, inculcates chivalry, warns against dangers and cultivates the virtues needed for a happy family life.[4] Not only the nature of virtues and vices should be brought out, but they should be brought into connection with vocational life. This will supply additional motivation for keeping straight.

Should Sex Instruction Be Given?

Another question is: "Should sex instructions be given to boys during a retreat?" First let me quote the words of Pope Pius XI as found in his recent Encyclical on Education. "Very widespread is the error of those who . . . promote so-called sexual education, falsely believing they can forewarn young people against the dangers of the senses with purely natural means. . . . In this delicate subject, if all things be considered, some individual instruction becomes necessary at the right moment on the part of those who have the educative mission, and all those precautions must be observed which conform to the well-known traditions of Catholic education. . . . Therefore, it is most important that the good parent,

[4] See *N. C. E. A. Bulletin*, 1932, no 1, pp. 213-230.

speaking to his child on such a dangerous subject, be well on his guard and do not go into details. . . ." Two things are definitely stated here: first, that public instruction in sex should not be given and, secondly, that some kind of private instruction (*i.e.*, not more than necessary at the time) may be given. Since it is well known that parents shirk this duty, it may be asked whether an instruction on sex in a closed retreat may be considered private. I do think so, especially if the number of boys is small and all are about of the same age and physical development. In such cases some definite instruction ought to be given for the purpose of elevating sex and to act as a prophylaxis against mal-information and scandal. Seemingly, there exists a sharp difference of opinion among educators in this matter, but *in praxi* they fairly well agree. What all Catholics reject is blunt medico-physical and anatomic instruction separated from virtue and morality. What they consider necessary is to counsel the doubtful, to protect the innocent, and to inform the ignorant in this delicate matter from chaste and approved sources.[5] What else can be done? The General Congregation of the Holy Office declared on March 21, 1931, after having rejected indiscriminate sex instruction, "that there must be carefully instilled in youth of both sexes sane, complete and uninterrupted religious education. There must be inspired in them esteem, desire and love of the angelic virtue. There must be highly recommended to them assiduity in prayer and the frequenting of the Sacraments of Penance and the Blessed Eucharist. They must be incited to nourish filial devotion to the Blessed Virgin, mother of holy purity, and to entrust themselves fully to her protection. They must be taught to avoid carefully dangerous reading, obscene spectacles, conversations with dishonest persons, and every occasion of sin," especially idleness. This is a very good plan and contains most of the retreat topics needed. If, in addition to presenting the beauty of the virtue, the temptations and their remedies are outlined together with means to strengthen the will, not much more seems to be needed as far as sex is concerned, except that hope and confidence should be aroused to encourage those who have already acquired bad habits, and that an opportunity be given to all to consult the retreat master

[5] See *Fortnightly Review*, September, 1931.

or other priest about anything that might worry them. This invitation to visit and consult a spiritual adviser should not be extended in connection with a talk on purity or on the Sixth Commandment; otherwise no one will come and, if any should come, others might consider them sex delinquents. Nor should confessors do more questioning about the Sixth and Ninth Commandments than at other times. The good disposition created in boys by the retreat will suffice in most cases.[6]

Number of Conferences

During a retreat of three days, as a rule, twelve instructions are given—two in the morning and two in the afternoon. To these an introduction and conclusion may be added. In the evening night prayers will be enough, since the rule for boys should be early to bed and early to rise. Spiritual exercises tire boys, and it is preferable to have them sleep in bed and awake in the chapel. Those who wish evening meditations for older boys, might prepare them in the form of a dialogue between the master and disciple, repeating the main points considered during the day and ending with a resolution or promise on part of the disciple. If interestingly presented, boys will listen and the promise or resolution might be repeated by all. If done, it might find its way into the retreat diary which boys should be advised to keep.

The topics of the retreat may be profitably grouped around the life of Christ or connected with biblical events. Bible stories are the best, but others may be interspersed, the more the better. Stories not only illustrate, but aid the memory and feed the imagination, which is quite important. Stories are remembered long after everything else has been forgotten.

It does not seem to be necessary to add a detailed plan of a boys' retreat. Institutions have their own plan for closed retreats, and open or parish retreats depend too much on circumstances. Moreover, every retreat master will offer suggestions whenever desired. For a conclusion an outline of instructions is added. It covers a three days' retreat and is capable of condensation or enlargement as needed.

[6] See "Watchful Elders," Chapters I-II.

1. Love of God: Creation, redemption, heaven.
2. Ingratitude of Man: Sin, its consequences, hell.
3. The Mercy of God: Blessings of a good confession.
4. The Grace of God: Temptations—a blessing or a curse.

---

5. Christ our Model in Piety and Obedience.
6. Christ our Model in Charity and Truth.
7. Christ the Way and the Light: Vocations.
8. Christ our True Friend: Holy Eucharist.

---

9. Mary Immaculate (Virgin most pure): Purity.
10. Mary our Mother: Help in danger.
11. Mary our Queen: Perseverance.
12. Signposts: Rule of Life.

Conclusion. St. Michael: God with us!

PRACTICAL ASCETICAL NOTES FOR PRIESTS

By Bede Jarrett, O.P.

VI. Our Lord's Teaching on How to Become Oneself

In the story of the passion and death of Our Lord after the scene of the Last Supper we pass on to the manifold sufferings and indignities He endured, to the long-drawn agony of dying, to His death itself, and then to that laying in the tomb which seemed to so many of them that watched or heard of it the end of a shattered hope. We however believe that this was by no means the end but the beginning of a new life, which itself was a triumph over death, the victory of the Resurrection. We are reminded that "life" was one of the phrases or words He most loved to use when He wished to describe what He was and what He came to do. Thus, He spoke of His purpose in coming as that whereby He might give life and more abundant life to men. His doctrine, too, He spoke of as life-giving, like refreshing water; He spoke of Himself as the very life He came to bring. Thus, He was to give Himself to people, and by the very gift of Himself was to make them more alive. To seal that teaching and to bring it into effect, the Resurrection was prophesied and enacted. The Resurrection is thus the story of an historic happening in the life of Our Lord, but also a proof of something else beyond itself. It is a model, a hope, even a cause that will achieve the same result in each follower of His; the cause of triumph over every adversary, defeat, death, over sin and the haunting memories of all our past. Thus, Easter not only helps us yearly to hope again, but further lays on us the obligation to hope. This is not only a counsel but a command; for hope is a virtue that must be practised by all Christians. The foundation of hope is, no doubt, in God Himself, but the stimulus to it will be found in the mystery of the Resurrection, showing that there is no cause so desperate, no defeat so apparently crushing, no condition so hopeless, to which, if God wills, triumph will not come.

This life of ours (it is here we must begin) is a gift to us from God. It is not of our choosing. It comes to us by His choice. Since it is of His choosing, it is of His designing. We neither made ourselves nor can manage ourselves as we would like, nor

manage the life that comes to us. For that very reason we can take a most hopeful view of life. If life lay under our own domination, we might well lose courage, seeing the whole burden lying on our shoulders. But the thought that it is His gift and after His design, gives us courage. If to this remembrance of God's creatorship we add the mystery of the Resurrection, we shall take even larger drafts of hope; for not life only but life's triumph lies entirely in the hands of God. Success is not the result of man's power but of divine power. Even in the life of Christ this was most manifest. It was the Godhead that raised the humanity to life again; as man, God had died.

Hope thus has now become entangled with doctrine. Despair has become more than ever a grave sin; of all grave sins it is the most mischievous, the most undoing, the most destructive of effort, the most paralysing. Against this courage is, not merely a happy choice, but a duty. See for a moment whence this duty springs. Easter has made victory seem possible in the direst of defeats. Not only had He died the death of a felon, but all His claims were remembered only to be turned into derision. Because of His very miracles they jeered at Him under the Cross: "He saved others; Himself He could not save." He had proclaimed His royalty: "For this was I born, for this came I into the world." What was there now to show for it but a crown of thorns and a title on the Cross: "This is the King of the Jews"—an open taunt of mockery! He came as a master to teach the world the living truth of God; He had gathered and trained a band of followers, and now what had become of His disciples? They were scattered. Only a short time before the soldiers had flung round the Master of Wisdom, as He claimed to be, the garment of a fool. He came with His claim to holiness: "Which of you can convict Me of sin?" Yet, His challenge was so little accounted that here He was dying the death of a criminal and seemingly abandoned by God. Why He even admitted it Himself upon the Cross! Could He be so holy, if at the end on His own testimony God had deserted Him?

No cause, we say, was so low as His, and yet He rose triumphant. That message of His Resurrection must not be forgotten. Least of all must it be forgotten by priests, who are often those that most need to remember it. Who is so tempted to discouragement

as a priest? If we were asked whom of men we thought most likely to be discouraged, we should have no hesitation in saying at once that in our experience it was the priest. Both from the point of view of what he judges to be his own little growth in holiness and of the many checks he receives in his work, he is liable to give way to discouragement that looks very like despair. He is interested in his spiritual state, and yet he so often has its shortcomings brought home to him—in his annual or biennial retreats, in his examination of conscience, perhaps above all when he is preaching to others and suddenly realizes that what he urges on others he has not yet done himself. He has made his efforts, but they have been so little effective that he almost despairs of ever overcoming his inveterate foes. Often he has made his resolutions and has realized what are his dangerous occasions; he has determined to avoid them or at least to be careful of himself in them since he cannot avoid them. But somehow the old conditions continue and the old faults remain. Or perhaps it is his work that seemed to be flourishing and now has fallen down; perhaps a small criticism of his sermons is sufficient to deter him from further effort—or the reported saying of some one, or the preference one of his friends has shown for another. What tiny stings from minute insects inflame the human body, irritate it, perhaps fester in it! Even tinier stings will ruin a man's contentment and bring about his discomfiture and discouragement. Or the failure of a soul he thought he had rescued will plunge him into the state of mind in which he despairs of others as well as of himself.

That will not do. That is untrue to the Resurrection. A moral doctrine is involved—our obligation to hope. There is no soul this side of death which is beyond redemption. That is our faith. There is no habit of sin, howsoever firmly lodged, that cannot be broken by God's power. Thus is the cry made to all men: "Thou shalt not despair." There is no human character, howsoever tortured and twisted, howsoever unpleasant, that we have met in life, which cannot be changed. That again is our faith. Nothing of evil is final. That alone is final which is determined by the will of God. There is no nation so low that it cannot be raised again to greatness, so poor that it cannot be restored to prosperity, so defeated

that He cannot give it the victory. There is no death over which He cannot ride triumphantly with His banner of life and His call to life.

But in His case His triumph came from this, that He submitted Himself absolutely to the power of God. He left His cause in the divine hands. He lifted no finger to protect Himself; though He saw the legions of Angels waiting for His orders to come and give Him comfort, He did not call to them. He accepted whatever God's will had designed for Him. He made no resistance; He was led like a lamb to the slaughter; He did not open His mouth. Now, we must fulfill the same condition if we desire a divine triumph. If you fight for your own hand, He does not promise you a crown. If you insist on going your own way through life, if you have already made up your mind what you are to get and how you are to get it, then your destiny will lie at the mercy of your own feeble powers. He promises life triumphant only to those who commit their cause to His hands. Go His way and accept His leading of you, and then He will give you the triumph He has designed for you: "I was dead and behold I live for ever more."

We need to remember this when we are dealing with our people —never to lose hope. We need to preach it to them year in and year out as our gospel of healing. We need to remember it, too, for our own soul's saving in our days of depression, discouragement, or even despair. He gives us what seems at first to be a dull thing, the doing of duty, the obligations of our priesthood; that is, He forces us to do what is His pleasure, His will; we can think it dull indeed or not as we will, yet we certainly have a motive for doing it joyously if we care to do so. But in being forced to do His will we could easily get into a state of mind in which we wonder whether, if we trust ourselves to God and refuse Him absolutely nothing that He asks of us, we shall not be left with a very dull life indeed. Shall we not lose the color of life and its sparkle? Sometimes young people (and not young people alone) talk of "seeing life," and mean by that phrase something contrary to the priestly or even Christian ideals. They talk indeed as though life were something one had to sink into, or steep oneself in; something beneath one, something in the gutter or that runs down the gutter.

They talk as though only those had lived really who had tasted all the excitements of sin. "Life" is what they call these excitements, as though goodness were something incredibly dull. But the great writers of our language have not all been men who tasted to the uttermost the fullness or the splendor of life or even its infinite variety, and we have as well the experience of many others who have had all this "life" and who yet got nothing out of life. These excitements are not in the least necessary for one to enjoy life or understand it. It is not variety in life that make for its understanding or its fullness; it is intensity of living. This is something very different indeed. What did Shakespeare see of life that he should be able so to interpret it? Yet, he touched life at every point. Who can sound, as Keats can, all the notes of human experience, the hopes, the fears, the dreams of human life? Yet, all he saw of life was a chemist's shop, consumption, and an early death. What experience had the Brontes to enrich their knowledge of human nature? In their remote Yorkshire village they found but little material on which to exercise their perceptions; but for man it is less the material which he experiences than the instrument which he uses in his experiences that is of importance. Not width of experience but delicacy of perception matters; and delicacy of perception can be produced as easily as width of experience: that is, both are the result of human activity. But one is a development of power and the other can be a dissipation of power. It is never the fullness of life but its intensity that makes the difference between these two. The flame it is that intensifies the power of each to know the world. When you shut steam within a cylinder, you get more power out of it, not less. When you give it freedom, you lose its effective value. Unless a soul be held down to duty, you lose its worth in the world. Look at Our Lord, at the narrowness of His life, the narrow limits of His tiny world, the shortness of His sojourn, the quietness of His days; yet His boast is: "I am the first and the last."

It should be evident to us, then, that Our Lord does show us the true way of regarding life and its meaning. He sets us the true note of victory by first setting us the true note of defeat. Unless we have been crucified with Him, we shall not rise with Him, is the burden of the teaching of St. Paul. If you die, you

shall live. If you surrender yourself wholeheartedly to Him, He will take you up with Him. Only from a tomb can a resurrection take place.

It will be seen, then, that we have a duty to hope always for ourselves and for others; and that this hope rests entirely on our faith in His Resurrection. Because He rose again, we know that never can we despair of ourselves or others. We build our hopefulness for others never on our experience of their good will or on their success so far; just as the knowledge of their lack of good will does not make us despair any more than would our remembrance of their continued failure, nor of course our own weakness or many falls. We trust always and only in the divine love for us, and so in the divine mercy. But then what could be a better basis for hope than that? That is an unchanging foundation which no experience can ever destroy.

We must have a quiet acceptance of the ways through which God leads us, going quietly hand and hand with God. We shall make no plans except such as can very easily be renounced when it is evident that they are not compatible with God's plans; we watch the days as they pass, taking those opportunities that are brought to our doors. Do not denounce the conditions of your life and blame them because you find yourself small-minded. All life is great to those who care to see it so. Duty, the will of God, quiet acceptance, no resistance to God's despoiling hand, these are the essential needs. Go as He went and you shall taste the glory that He tasted as the First of us all and the Last of us, leading us home.

TOWARDS LOVING THE PSALMS

By C. C. Martindale, S.J., M.A.

VI. The Deeper Self in the Psalms

One of the most disconcerting facts about Hebrew religion is the extreme slowness with which it achieved any idea of "heaven." Were we not confining ourselves to the Psalms, it would be easy to illustrate this from different books of the Old Testament. No more than any other ancient people, did the Hebrews deny *survival;* but their notion of survival was that of one which didn't seem worth having. Their conception of *Sheol* cannot have differed much from that of the Assyrian or Babylonian, who thought of it as a dark and dusty place where the "shades" remained practically unconscious. The older Greek conception was much the same. The ghost flits faintly twittering down to the Hidden Land, while "the man himself" remains dead on the battlefield. The ghosts are but strengthless things (*ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα*); the wits are not in them; they need to drink some blood before they can understand or speak. The Greeks, uncomfortable about this prospect (as anyone might well be), tried to escape from it by magical formulas and initiations (such as those of the "Mysteries"), but these became shot through with Orphic or Pythagorean doctrines: either you had what definitely resembles a purgatory and ended up in a "heaven," or you were "incurable" and finished up in the fathomless slime of the abyss. Or again, you passed through cycle after cycle of existence, till at long last you "flew off from the sorrowful, weary wheel." Both for the Greek and for the Roman, the ghost, when it got out from its world (which it did once or twice a year), was on the whole malignant. It envied the "real live man," and had to be cheated with food put outside the houses or at least in the corridors, lest it should come further in and harm the inhabitants. The Roman, always a kindlier creature (I feel) than the Greek, supplemented his gloomy Ghost-Days by the feast of *Cara Caristia* (or *Cara Cognatio*), when not only the living family buried its feuds and assembled at one table; not only were the little statues of the household gods invited too, but places were laid for the dead; ghosts, gods and men all met in friendly union.

The Hebrews did nothing so charming. But, as always, they had

their special element. They were supremely distressed because the dead could no more "praise God."

> "I am filled with woes. . . . My life is near the Grave: already I am counted as one who has gone down into the pit. No one can help me. . . . I am lonely among the dead (*i.e.*, I am cut off from all real friends) . . . like slain men sleeping in their tomb . . . whom Thou rememberest no more, for they are cut off from Thy hand."

The Psalmist (lxxxvii. 5-13) prays that he may be rescued from death:

> "Thou art not likely to work miracles for the dead. . . . Doctors will not raise them back to praise Thee (the Hebrew says: "Or shall the Ghosts rise up to praise Thee?"). Is anyone, in the grave, likely to tell of Thy mercy—or, in the Lost Land, of Thy faithfulness? Shall Thy wonders be made known in the darkness, or Thy justice in the Forgotten World?"

Compare with this Psalm vi. 6: "In Death there is no one that praiseth Thee: in Sheol, who will give thanks to Thee?" And Psalm xxix. 10: "What use is there in my blood, if I go down into the grave? Shall mere dust praise Thee or announce Thy faithfulness?" (cfr. verse 4). Psalm cxiii. 25, having said that the heavens belong to God and the Earth to man, proceeds: "Not the dead shall praise Thee, Lord—not any of them who go down into Sheol: but *we* who are still *alive!*" "Their graves are their homes for ever—their dwellings, for ever and ever. . . . Like sheep are they swept away—death shepherds them into Sheol" (Ps. xlvii. 12, 15). "Let them go down alive into Sheol!" (Ps. liv. 16) means: "Let them die in the fullness of life—suddenly, without the rehearsal of sickness!" Neither princes nor any man can help you: "when his breath goes forth, he reverts to his original clay: then come all his schemes to nothing" (Ps. cxlv. 4).

This is part of the Hebrew's conviction of the passing nature of the world; it was, compared with God, as nothing. We are often reminded that a man can draw false conclusions from perfectly sound major premisses: "God exists, because otherwise nothing else could: but several sorts of things exist—fire, earth, trees. Therefore, there are several sorts of Gods." "God exists and all depends on Him: but frightful things happen; therefore God is cruel and needs to be propitiated by slaughter. He likes it."

Now, I think that the Hebrew was so smothered (as it were) by the reality, eternity, supremacy of GOD, that he hardly was *able* to examine deeply into the nature of the relative transitoriness of everything else. His imagination was so profoundly struck by the vanishing of created things, and his intelligence so possessed by the certainty of the enduringness of God, that he hardly speculated whether *man* might not be *lasting* in some exceptional way.

"Thou hast made my days 'measurable'—easily counted up from end to end (Hebrew: a mere span); what I consist of is as nothing before Thee: yes, everything is as nothing—yes, each living man. Yes, like a shadow doth man pass: idle are his anxious efforts" (Ps. xxxviii. 6, 7).

We are familiar with the splendid Psalm ci, where the Psalmist sees his days like a shadow that lengthens and lengthens, and then suddenly vanishes into the general dark—but he then broadens his vision, and acknowledges that God, at the beginning, made both heavens and earth—the iron heavens; the "too, too solid" earth. Yet, even these shall perish, but God shall still endure. They shall shred themselves away like any garment: God, robed with light as with a garment, yet shall "change" them, and they shall disappear. "But Thou art the self-same, and *Thy* years shall not fail."

St. Paul made superb use of this (Hebrews, i); but the next verse provides us with a bridge into a different world, into which the Psalmist's mind kept tending to enter, and did so successfully, at least when God's promises were concerned: there should be an enduring *Israel*; and it was more than the human soul, the individual soul, could suffer, if it were to have no consciousness at all of this.

I think this is the crevice through which the Hebrew mind crawled out into the idea of a real, though intermittent, perception of personal, conscious, worshipful, and happy immortality. Certainly, several of the Psalmist's declarations that God will not "leave" him in Sheol are violent expressions that he is *"as good as dead,"* but that God will still rescue him. "God rescues me from the hand of hell, when it clutches at me" (Ps. xlviii. 16). All sorts of woes have come upon me, yet "Thou wilt again restore me and pull me forth from the chaos beneath the earth" (Ps. lxx. 20). This answers the question of Psalm lxxxviii. 49: "What

man lives that shall not die? Who rescues his life from Sheol?" And in Psalm xv. 10, we read: (I am full of confidence, for) "Thou wilt not abandon me to Sheol, nor permit Thy chosen one to be destroyed." The Biblical Commission, presumably because of the use made of this text in the Acts (among other reasons), has pronounced that we are to recognize in these words a prophecy of Our Lord's Resurrection, and we readily do so if only it is because we, precisely, are those who can see the full meaning of prophetic words, and the same Commission has long ago declared that the prophet *himself* need not have known the prophetic nature of what he said, nor indeed need an inspired writer have known that he was inspired.

However, in Psalm cii we read the following: "As a father pities his children, so pitieth the Lord those that fear Him. . . . He knoweth well what we are made of; He remembereth that we are but dust. Man—his days are like the grass's; the scorching wind sweeps over it, and it remains no more: even so, man's place remembereth him not" (so the Hebrew: the Latin, "man no more remembereth its—or his—place," is less straightforward (Ps. cii. 15, 16). Such sentences, passing as they do into a triumphant declaration of the enduring nature of God's mercy, are among those that make you feel sure that, if the Hebrew had it *put to him* in so many words, "Surely God *will* enable a man to be aware of Him, to praise Him, and be glad in Him, even beyond the grave," he would have assented. Such a victory for God, such loyalty and endless lovingkindness on the part of God, are *more in keeping* with all the other things that the Hebrew believed about God, than the idea of God's forgetting a man once his body had died. That was a sort of unexamined inheritance: he had not looked into it; he had turned his mind to other ethical problems (such as the apparent success of the wicked); his mistake, in so far as it was a mistake, was due to his imagination, stirred by what he saw of *man*, and could hardly have subsisted if he had simply continued to work out the perfectly true things that he essentially was thinking about *God*. He could, without difficulty, have followed what he knew about God's power over death and life, and over nature's *recurrent* life. God sends forth His snow and ice—rivers themselves are immobilized by His frost (Ps. cxlvii. 5-7); but then, He sends forth

His word, and it thaws them; His winds, and they make the waters flow anew.

In the magnificent Psalm (ciii) that reviews all creation, everything is seen depending upon God for food and existence itself. When God gives it, they take it; when He hides His face, they are in dismay; when He withdraws His breath (Vulgate: *their* breath), they faint and fall back into their dust. But then, if He sends forth that breath again, life too begins again, and He renews the face of the earth (27-30).

It seems, then, impossible to me that the Hebrew had not in his *inner self* everything necessary for a clear and happy belief in immortality; it was only a step from the recognition that God's spirit gave life and recurrent life to the vegetation that seemed to die, to the perception that He could maintain life in the man who seemed to die. Not only, in this way, would he have had a far clearer vision of the *way* in which justice would be done (and that God did do justice was held very strongly by him); not only would he have been freed from very awkward affirmations (such as, that "I was young, and now I have grown old, but never yet have I seen the righteous man abandoned, nor his children begging for bread"), but he would have been able to develop his sense of "conscience" even further and more swiftly than he did. It is of this very real sense of interior righteousness, and by no means only legal or ritual righteousness, that I hope to write next time. For even we, even we, can tend to drop back towards the righteousness that consists in obedience to the letter of the law, and turn into those scribes and Pharisees who were *not* the genuine product of the Psalms!

HOME WORK, AN AID TO SCHOOL WORK

By Paul E. Campbell, A.M., Litt.D., LL.D.

Home work assignment on the part of the school is one of the most discussed subjects in education today. Articles pro and con appear frequently in educational magazines. As evidence of contemporary interest of Catholic educational authorities, we find papers on the subject in the annual Proceedings of the National Catholic Educational Association for 1928, 1929 and 1931.

Opposition comes chiefly from parents. In presenting their case they seem to labor under a misimpression that the teaching profession is likely to adopt a contemptuous or supercilious attitude whenever any proposals for the abolition or amelioration of home work are mooted. But educators are not a unit in advocating assignments to be done outside class hours. They tell us that the amount and kind of home work must depend on various factors, such as the age of the pupil, his mental ability, his physical capacity and his home conditions. The Assistant Masters' Association (London) affirm the value and necessity of home work as a means of study free from the restrictions of class work, but insist that it should be limited in amount and definitely apportioned among the various subjects.

We have seen that there are many factors to be taken into account before a hard and fast rule can be established. Universally, the value and the need of home work must be largely determined by local conditions. Dr. W. J. O'Shea tells us that the amount and the kind of home work given depend largely on the kind of curriculum the schools have and on the amount of time that is being devoted to each subject. Where a harassed teacher is required to care for the educational destiny of 60, 70 or 80 pupils, there is very little opportunity for individual instruction or for individualized supervision of study. The teacher may have a high opinion of the Dalton plan (in which individualized instruction represents the chief method of procedure) or of the Winnetka plan (in which each pupil proceeds at his own rate under the individual guidance of the teacher), but he knows that either plan is inapplicable in his circumstances. He can lead his many pupils to a mastery of the material outlined in the course of study only through the medium of group instruction. Home work in the nature of review is almost a necessity. The average five-hour school

day is not sufficient for the work that the school must accomplish. Some advocate a longer school day that will give time for supervised study. Under this plan, say its proponents, boys and girls can prepare their lessons in a much shorter time and with better results than when they are required to prepare them at home.

If it be true that the American school is still a reciting rather than a learning center, there is no doubt that school conditions are far from ideal. But the mere lengthening of the school day will not remedy such an ill. Supervised study is not a panacea. From the standpoint of the teacher, who must spend many hours outside of school in the planning and preparation of lessons, our present school day is long enough. The addition of another hour will scarcely make supervised study feasible as a substitute for home work. No one questions the need of directed learning. Every teacher who knows his task endeavors to supervise the study of his pupils. He seeks to make the pupil learn how to learn.

Supervised study enables the teacher to study and correct the individual weaknesses of each pupil. The overcrowding of our schools, the excessive pupil load of the teacher, makes it almost impossible to employ this procedure effectively. Under ideal conditions supervised study can conceivably make home work unnecessary; but under actual conditions the proper use of home work will enable the intelligent teacher to approximate with a large class the happy results that supervised study makes possible with a small class. The great object of home work is to correct individual weaknesses. When properly assigned and carefully checked, the home work directs the further efforts of the teacher with each individual pupil.

The teacher may know of peculiar home conditions that make home work morally impossible. In such cases other means must be employed to discover and correct individual weaknesses. The girl who must give many hours to house work, the boy who must help support the family by working after school hours, may not be able to find time for any school work outside of school hours. These exceptional cases do not outlaw home work for all pupils. The teacher may be vexed to find that the parents take no interest in the school progress of their child, that they exert no effort to provide a proper place for study in the home, that the child must work

amid distractions that make concentration an impossibility; but only a weak teacher will, for these reasons, frown upon all home work. It is sometimes urged that pupils seek help from their father, mother or older brothers or sisters, that they often offer as their own work prepared by others. Such practices tend to develop mental weaknesses and the habit of deceit. Must home work be discontinued on this account? If so, we must by the same token discontinue any human institution that is subject to abuse by man.

Parents should take that interest in the school careers of their children which will prompt them to offer constructive help where possible. The child who learns to do some regular routine domestic duties without being told when and what to do, has good training towards the doing of his home work. Parents who are concerned about the child's character, as well as his success in school, should see that he has a regular time and place for study, that nothing interferes with his home work preparation, that when he has written home work he prepares it carefully and neatly and hands it in at school on time. These thoughts are contained in a brochure on the subject prepared by the United States Bureau of Education.

Many teachers are opposed to home assignments because of a conviction that teaching methods are so radically different from those of a generation ago that only confusion can result when a parent tries to coöperate in the education of the modern child. Not all parents agree with this. Anne Procter Conly, a mother writing in *American Childhood,* tells of her own experience. After the sickness of her children she sought to help them cover lost ground in school but met the rebuff: "Aw, Mother, that is not the way we do it in school." She knew that the principles of education must remain ever the same and tried to learn the differences in the methods of presentation of the modern school. Armed with a copy of the course of study, she mastered the new content and the new method of approach. Her interest and her willingness to learn with them stimulated her children and won the promise of extra-school help from the teachers. It is an easy matter for parents to learn, as Mrs. Conly learned, the operations and the methods of the modern school and thus place themselves in a position to give constructive help to their children.

Unwise and indiscriminate assignment of home work has con-

tributed more than any other factor to the prejudice that many parents have conceived against it. A classroom teacher, teaching the same pupils in all subjects, may exercise discretion; but in the departmental organization, where a number of teachers assign work in separate subjects, the burden readily grows beyond endurance. The overworked pupil prepares the work assigned by the teacher with a dominant personality, or by his favorite teacher, or by the one who applies most severe sanctions. If the best interests of the pupils are to be served, the teachers must coöperate in the making of reasonable assignments. The pupils should not have home work in too many subjects, nor an overload in any one subject.

The wisdom of the teacher will temper assignments in accord with the social and economic condition of the home, the physical and mental capacity of the pupil. Hygienic home study is seldom an impossibility even in the homes of the very poor. The reasonable assignment seldom interferes with the leisure time activities that well-to-do parents may consider essential to the proper development of their children. We may never succeed in having the home send definite reports of home work periods to the teacher, but the assignment affords an opportunity to strengthen the tie that should unite the home and the school. The parent can cooperate very effectively by setting a definite schedule of time and place for home work. He can maintain favorable conditions and eliminate distractions destructive of concentration. He may help much by providing a minimum of necessary equipment, such as pens, pencils, ink and paper, readily accessible to the home pupil. Mrs. Conly, whose experience we have recounted above, went further and installed some necessary maps and a blackboard. In the library of every home where pupils study or write assignments there should be a modern dictionary adequate to the needs of the student. Well-disposed parents sometimes spend much money foolishly in the purchase of reference books that have no value. The school can give invaluable assistance in the selection of suitable reference books to parents able and willing to provide these helps. Teachers can elicit the interest of parents in the home tasks of their children by asking the father or the mother to sign the written work at least once a week.

All authorities agree on certain important points. The assignment of home work should never be given as a punishment nor should the class be thus punished for the failure of one or a few students. The great advantage of the extra-class assignment is the easy check it gives the teacher upon the individual progress and the individual difficulties of his pupils. Supervised study or individualized instruction may remove many obstacles thus discovered from the intellectual pathway of the pupil. If at any time it becomes apparent that the pupil does not know how to study alone, the teacher must desist from written or non-written assignments and help him learn how to study with comprehension and a consequent pleasure of accomplishment. The ideal teacher will teach his disciples by the methods that will best insure a continuation of their eagerness to learn and an agreeable satisfaction in the progress of that learning.

There is a soft pedagogy that deprecates all home work as a psychological mistake and an unnatural strain on the physical and mental powers of the growing child. "Home work is a nightly curse in thousands of homes and a cause of nerve trouble, sleeplessness and family friction." Terrible if true. But medical science does not attempt to prove that the child may not devote time outside of formal class hours to the acquisition of knowledge. The entire five hours of the school day are not a constant strain on the mental capacity of pupils. Parents who condemn home assignments as destructive of all opportunity for the amenities of family life will allow children to dawdle over a simple task until they become a source of vexation to the members of the family. Opponents make much of a fancied nervous strain, but freely permit young children to attend stirring adventure movies from the nervous excitement of which many do not recover for a period of 70 hours, as proved in a recent investigation. One hour of home work, they tell us, causes loss of sleep, but many hours frittered away in distracting amusements of no physical or mental value are permitted under the plea of recreation.

There are abnormal children who are constitutionally unfitted to derive benefit from home work, just as there are abnormal children who cannot endure the measure of concentration required of the American school child during the five hours of the school

day. The norms of school discipline are adjusted to the average child. It is difficult to prove that this average child suffers mental or physical injury from the normal work required by the school. Teachers must assign work prudently, carefully determining the amount of time required for the completion of the task. They should ask their pupils from time to time just how long it requires to perform a specified assignment and be guided by the honest reports given. They may frequently find that their own estimate of the time required does not agree with the time actually employed by the pupil in the completion of the task. What is the maximum of time that may be demanded of the pupil in the home preparation of lessons? A report of the New York Board of Superintendents advises teachers that they should not let the home work exceed one hour for fifth and sixth grade pupils. The same authority places a limit of one and one-half hours in the seventh and eighth grades. It is seemingly supposed that no home assignment should be given to children below the fifth grade, although some authorities, among them Mrs. Conly, contend that children in the third grade can do effective work at home. Educators do not advocate home work for children in the first three grades; many say that none should be given to children under ten years of age.

All home assignments should be in the nature of review rather than advance work. Superintendent Goldstein of Brooklyn directs his teachers to make home work in great measure application of work studied in class. They must first make sure that the pupil knows how to proceed and what to do. The work assigned should not be always of the same type, but rather varied. Let the teacher definitely assign the work and clearly define its limitations. At no time should the work be of such difficulty that the pupil is practically forced to seek help from the members of the family. The teacher may avoid this by carefully explaining in advance in the classroom the work that the pupil is expected to do at home. Part of the recitation period is properly devoted to this preparation of home tasks. It is regretfully true that many teachers make teaching consist in hearing recitations. The most effective teacher is he who not only asks but also explains, amplifies, illustrates graphically, calls for questions from the pupils—who in a word makes the pupils think for themselves.

In her paper at the Chicago meeting of the National Catholic Educational Association in 1928, Sister Perpetua stressed the value of home work in developing a sense of responsibility and promoting continuity and direction in the pupil's intellectual work outside of school. She advocated written home work strongly because it gives this continuity and direction. She referred to the half-hearted class recitations of children who had prepared their work through home study. Written home work, she tells us, forces attention and helps to fasten the day's work. The teacher may expend much energy and ingenuity in developing, for instance, a new case in arithmetic, and feel that he has given his pupils complete command of the difficulty involved. It is surprising and disconcerting on the following day to find that the pupils exhibit no familiarity whatever with the previous day's lesson. A blank expression on the countenances of the pupils meets the questions of the teacher regarding the process that he thought full surely had been mastered on the previous day. He must repeat the work of yesterday, not as a test or drill, but as a new lesson. Sister Perpetua tells us that here is evidence that no provision was made for continuity of thought. The assignment of written home work would have stimulated the pupils and sustained their concentration because of the need of producing the results at home away from school. When the pupil is thus stimulated by the prospect of written home work, he stores away the knowledge in such a way that he has it within the reach of recall. He develops a sense of responsibility in regard to the work done in class. He knows that he must reproduce, independent of school and teacher, what was given him in school.

Perhaps our attitude has been too apologetic. Let us boldly say that home work is a necessary part of teaching procedure in the modern American school. It does not rob the child of recreation. Home work is rather an aid in the valuation of recreation. The teacher may make home work practical—in English, for example, by encouraging the child to give a report of the moving picture he went to see or of the party he attended. Such an assignment gives meaning and purpose to his ordinary employment of leisure. Leisure well employed is of high worth, but leisure unemployed is mere idleness and helpless drifting along the stream of life. It

may at first be a burden upon the pupil to know that he must report in his own words a musicale or an entertainment that he attends. He learns perhaps with difficulty to express himself fluently. With practice he achieves a certain facility in expression, he gains pleasure from this self-expression, and the very need for it gives him greater appreciation of the musicale or entertainment.

In the assignment of home work the teacher must always strive to add to the pupil's store of useful knowledge and skills. There has been too much of what might be called "occupational" home work; let us have more "constructive" home work. Too often the teacher was able to give as sole justification for home assignments the fact that a busy child is not on the streets after dark. The real teacher makes home work a supplement and a review of class work. It becomes a procedure by which the teacher is assisted in diagnostic and remedial work. There is a secondary purpose which forms a very desirable outcome: to have young people form habits of study, reading, invention and research which will last through life and offer inspiration for the profitable use of leisure time.

We cannot here enter into consideration of the specific question of home work in high school. Dr. Kirsch of Toledo read a paper on this subject at the Toledo meeting of the National Catholic Educational Association in 1929. By means of a questionnaire, anonymously answered, he established that the average high school student spends an average of three hours daily in the home preparation of school assignments. He found that the high school student views home work as important only when it is written, that the great majority were of the opinion that home work regularly done develops habits of industry. He sums up his findings as follows: (1) it is the conviction of teachers and students that home work is a necessary part of high school training; (2) home work is a desirable part of each day's accomplishment; (3) written work is probably over-emphasized to the sacrifice of better possibilities in non-written assignments; (4) high school students generally are willing and eager to coöperate with the requirements set down for them. Dr. Kirsch gives a parting word of counsel to teachers to the effect that they should be conscious of the responsibility that is theirs in directing and coördinating the intellectual work of their students in and out of school.

DE CATECHIZANDIS PARVULIS

By F. H. Drinkwater

VI. The Parrot and the Dove

Here is an item I extracted from the daily paper a little while ago:

CHILD WHO KNEW ALL SAFETY RULES

Ran Into a Lorry

Although she could repeat the safety-first rules right through, Elizabeth Hilda Harper, of Wavell Road, Washwood Heath, Birmingham, has died as a result of a road accident.

Her skull was fractured when she ran out from behind a passing motor-car into a coal lorry.

"Theory and practice are two different things," commented the coroner (Dr. W. H. Davison) when told by the mother of her child's knowledge of the safety rules.

"Accidental death" was the verdict.

"She could repeat the safety-first rules right through." The words were in her memory all right but that is not the way things get into the practical part of the mind. Probably, too, those safety-first rules were written in very plain and simple language, for any child to understand. Even so, they remained only words to Elizabeth Hilda. Useless as they were to her, they would have been still more useless if they had been full of polysyllabic words and bits of technical terminology from Traffic Control Board reports.

Our Catechisms are rather like that. The case against the parrot-system—well, wait a minute. Let us define our terms. I am going to say rude things about the parrot system, so let us be clear what I mean by it. Do I mean by the "parrot system" just learning things by heart? No, of course not. It may be good to learn things by heart, especially things like prayers and poetry, so long as it is not carried to a burdensome extent. When I talk about the parrot system, I am thinking only of statements in scientifically exact theological language, such as our Catechisms largely consist of. Even

these may sometimes usefully be learned by heart, if they are learned by those who have first understood their meaning; but not if they are learned parrot-like by those to whom they mean nothing.

The very quality of scientific precision that makes language so helpful to theological correctness also makes it difficult for the child-mind to receive. We must cheerfully admit that there is a permanent discrepancy between the aims of the theologian as such and the catechist as such, though they *may* both be happily united in the same man. The theologian aims at eliminating from his language every trace of imagination; the catechist knows that only by appealing to the imagination can he reach the mind and will.

Some time ago a priest wrote a handbook for teachers, and suggested they should say to young children, "Grace is when God Himself comes to live in our soul," adding Our Lord's words that "We will come to Him and make Our abode with Him." Two different ecclesiastical censors refused to pass this description, and demanded that there should be strict definition of grace as "a quality of the soul," or as "a supernatural gift enabling us to believe in, hope in, and love God," and so on. In the end the Imprimatur was obtained by omitting the passage altogether; however, the censors allowed Our Lord's words to stand.

Let us define the parrot system, then, as the committing to memory of statements in scientific language before the mind is ready to receive them. I don't know very well the Catechisms used in other English-speaking countries, but the one used in England is very largely in what I call scientific language; abstract ideas, logical divisions, technical terminology, definitions, and so on. I don't say it is necessarily any the worse for that, but such things cannot afford nourishment to the minds of Juniors and Infants, and we must keep on saying so until everybody sits up and takes notice.

Without pretending to any scholarship, I am sure it is undeniable that Catechisms as we know them now were brought in by Luther, who quite early in the Reformation began to issue his Catechism to the heads of families to be taught to their children and apprentices. Up to that time, for popular teaching, the living Voice of the Church had been regarded as sufficient, expressed flexibly and sensitively in the myriad tones and accents of numberless priests and instructors. It was the way that had come down from Our Lord

Himself—who chose to entrust His teaching, for better or for worse, to human intermediaries through all generations to come.

Instead of being satisfied with this way and trying to make it work better, instead of relying on teachers trained and then sent out to do their best, Luther decided for print and paper and a fixed form of words. His Catechism was intended as a sort of gramophone record of Dr. Martin Luther, to be turned on in every home. It seemed a great success at first, and for some centuries everybody imitated it, getting further and further away from the genuinely popular style which Luther had aimed at, and becoming more and more ruthless in the loads they heaped upon the memories of bored or frightened children. Catechisms for the laity was a good enough idea, but not Catechisms as a teaching device to replace the mental effort of the teacher.

The parrot system has had a long run, but everybody whose sight is not dulled by habit and prejudice can see now that it is the enemy of true religion. It seems hardly worth while attacking it directly, since it is bound to crumble away of itself if the better ways spread and grow. There is always that "if." There is no such thing as inevitable "progress," even in Catholic affairs.

The other day, one of the Catholic papers, reviewing one of our Birmingham aid-books for teachers, gave it generous praise and then added: "We confess to being only half-converted to the methods of what may be called the 'Birmingham School,' taken by themselves, and are still inclined to think that the learning of the Catechism should be begun quite early, with careful explanations all the time."

"Quite early with careful explanations." Well, that is more or less what I thought myself when we brought out the first version of the *Sower* Scheme. "Let's begin the Catechism at eight years instead of five, and with the easiest questions first," we said. "But let's have it understood, not learned parrot fashion." A scheme on those lines was approved for optional use in our diocese, and I was made Diocesan Inspector of Schools. "Get rid of that wretched parrot system," said Archbishop McIntyre when he appointed me. For four years I spent all my time visiting the schools, a good number of which were using our optional scheme.

Well, like your President Roosevelt (if you will pardon such an exalted comparison), I soon found that my first experiment had not

gone far enough. At the end of the four years I had to admit that the junior children, even in the best-taught schools, could not really take an intelligent interest in the Catechism words. They could understand quite well in their own way (of course) all Catholic doctrine; but if you pressed them for signs of understanding of the Catechism words they had learned, and which the teachers had conscientiously tried to "explain" to them according to my Scheme, they were evidently bothered and unequal to the situation. And this (it was clear to me then, with the children in front of me) was not because of any inadequacy on the part of the teachers, but simply because the things I had asked the teachers to do—to "explain" the English Catechism to children of that age—was an impossibility. If children of that age must learn the printed Catechism at all (I decided), it would be better to let them learn it like parrots than to persecute them for "explanations." *Atqui* (I said and would still say), to go back to the parrot system is unthinkable. *Ergo,* let us defer the printed Catechism till the Senior stage, when the children are more able to understand it.

So that is how we came to have the present Birmingham Scheme, which aims, not at forcing anybody to abandon the parrot system (force is no remedy, at any rate in education), but rather at setting everybody free to follow the better ways.

As to what the better ways are, there still seem to be people who profess not to have heard of them. "It's all very well to take away the Catechism from the younger children," they say, "but what is to take its place?" The previous articles of this series have tried to indicate in general terms what the answer to such a question would be. This is not the place for details, but the New Catechetics is already an old story in Germany, Belgium, United States, and doubtless in other countries that I have not kept up with. In England it has come to be associated with a journal called *The Sower,* and there is quite a little library of teachers' aid-books published by Burns, Oates & Washbourne. In the United States Dr. Shields was a valiant pioneer, but the latest and best example I am acquainted with is a children's text (published in a variety of forms) called "Jesus and I," by Fr. A. Heeg, S.J. Like St. Francis Xavier, Fr. Heeg knows all about the Three Practical Procedures; in fact, there does not seem to be anything he has not thought of.

We don't know yet (it might be objected) what the results of

the new methods will be. Well, I think some good results are visible enough already, but that again would be another story. Meanwhile we know only too well the results of the parrot system. Even its own special claim, to fix the words of the Catechism successfully and permanently in the mind, does not survive common observation. Those who are fond of questionnaires and statistics (over here we all admire the inexhaustible appetite of American readers for such things) will find in the July number of *The Sower* definite figures from a small-scale investigation which certainly goes some way to disproving the main contention of our present parrot worshippers.

"Your system would be all right if teachers were perfect," people say now and then to Sower-schemers, and I suppose they say the same in America to Dr. George Johnson and Fr. Heeg and Dr. MacEachen and Dr. Cooper and Fr. Dennerle and Fr. Kirsch and Fr. Furfey and all the others who seem to be trying to make religious instruction more of a reality.

The reply is that a good many Catholic teachers *are* perfect, or as near perfection as one can reasonably hope for in such a world as this; and the great thing is to give these a fair chance of giving their best. As for the imperfect ones, they will be imperfect under any system, but the system which gives their imperfection the fullest scope is the parrot system.

There is a good deal of laziness in human nature, and for the last four hundred years thousands of rather indolent or sluggish-minded instructors, clerical and lay, have considered that their obligation was satisfied when they had made the children learn a Catechism by rote. We might perhaps risk a parrot system if it was to be administered by Saints and geniuses, but with ordinary human nature it provides an all-too-obvious temptation to take the line of least resistance.

Anyhow, the parrot is rather a heathenish creature, ugly and loud and given (they say) to bad language. If there is to be a bird to hover above the religious instruction class, I would rather put my faith in the dove, a much more Christian kind of symbol. We should all be the better for more devotion, and a more trustful devotion, to the Holy Spirit. And if anybody says that this is conspicuously true of the present article, I shall be the last to deny it.

PROCEDURAL LAW OF THE CODE

By Stanislaus Woywod, O.F.M., LL.B.

Witnesses and Experts in Beatification and Canonization

In processes of beatification all the faithful except those specified in Canon 2027, §2, n. 1, are bound, even though not summoned as witnesses, to bring to the notice of the Church those things which in their opinion disprove the virtue, or miracles, or martyrdom of a servant of God (Canon 2023).

The whole life of a person whose cause of beatification has been instituted in the ecclesiastical court is to be investigated. The correct valuation of such a person's life is a matter which concerns all members of the Catholic Church, not those only who are actually summoned by the court to testify concerning the character, miracles, or martyrdom of that person. For this reason the Code of Canon Law rules that all the faithful must assist the Church to arrive at a true judgment on the important points in the beatification process. Wherefore, if one has personal knowledge of things which disprove the sanctity of life, the truth of a miracle claimed to have been worked through the intercession of a servant of God, or the facts of martyrdom, such a person is in duty bound to appear before the beatification tribunal, although he has not been summoned. He does his duty by manifesting to the court his readiness to appear; the court must decide whether or not he should be admitted to testify. The only person excused from this duty is the confessor of the servant of God, who is absolutely barred from testifying concerning the life and character of his former penitent. The reason for the rule is evident, because the knowledge gained through confession about the life and character of a person is not subject to any human inquiry, either before the Church or the secular tribunal.

What Persons Must Be Summoned to Testify

As witnesses must be summoned by the promoter of the faith, though not proposed by the postulator, especially all those who lived or associated with the servant of God (Canon 2024).

The postulator in beatification cases is the person who endeavors to prove that a servant of God is worthy to be beatified. He has to

furnish proof to that effect, and he proposes witnesses, documents, and all other things that are apt to prove his contention. The promoter of the faith is one of the officials of the beatification tribunal who has the special duty to watch the correctness of the whole procedure of the court and to examine with the greatest care and solicitude all proofs advanced in favor of the servant of God and to get a complete proof of his life and character. Since those who lived in the same house with the servant of God, or were otherwise closely associated with him in life, know more of his life and character than others, the promoter of the faith is charged to summon those persons to testify before the beatification tribunal. The Code states that *all* persons who were closely associated with the servant of God should be summoned as witnesses. If the number of those persons is very large, it would not be practical to call all of them, nor does the law seem to require that all be called and questioned, for Canon 2020 states that at least eight witnesses are required to prove the reputation for virtues, martyrdom and miracles. It is important, however, that nobody who was intimately acquainted with the servant of God, and who appears to be less favorable towards his sanctity of life, be excluded if he wishes to testify. The tribunal must in such cases examine whether there is personal animosity against the servant of God, and what caused the ill feeling that such a witness holds against him.

Concerning Voluntary Witnesses

Unless they already know that they are to be summoned as witnesses, all persons mentioned in the two preceding Canons, 2023-2024, must inform their proper Ordinary by letter whether they have been associated with the servant of God, and briefly explain whether they know of some peculiar fact which should be revealed, and what it is; the Ordinary shall forward these letters to the promoter of the faith.

Religious men and women shall seal these letters, and transmit them immediately and directly to the Ordinary or to the promoter of the faith, or shall hand them to the confessor, who shall see that they are forwarded as soon as possible to the Ordinary or to the promoter of the faith.

Illiterate persons shall explain the matter to the pastor, who shall report it to the Ordinary or the promoter of the faith (Canon 2025).

Religious superiors are under grave obligation to see that all their subjects who are obliged to testify shall do so, but shall beware of urging them either directly or indirectly to testify in one manner rather than in another (Canon 2026).

The foregoing two Canons speak of voluntary witnesses, that is to say, persons who have been intimately acquainted with the servant of God, but who have not been summoned by the beatification tribunal to testify and who of their own accord ask to be heard in the beatification court. They may correspond in the matter either with the Ordinary of the place where they reside, or with the promoter of the faith of the beatification court. The religious men and women who volunteer to be witnesses in the case shall signify their intention by letter addressed either to the Ordinary of the diocese in which they live or to the promoter of the faith of the beatification tribunal. Though all religious communities have the regulation that members must hand their letters to the local superior unsealed, in order that they may be inspected before being mailed, an exception is made here in favor of correspondence concerning the beatification process. Besides, the religious superiors are commanded by the Code to see that those religious who are obliged to testify fulfill their obligation, but they are forbidden to influence them in any manner to testify in favor of or against the character of the servant of God.

Any illiterate persons who were intimately acquainted with the servant of God and who desire to testify should make the request orally to the pastor of the place where they are living, and the pastor is to inform either the Ordinary or the promoter of the faith in order that they may take further steps to have that person testify in court.

Qualification of Witnesses

Blood-relations, relations by marriage, servants, heretics and infidels may be admitted as witnesses.

The following may not be admitted as witnesses: (1) the confessor in accordance with Canon 1757, §3, n. 2; (2) the postulator, the attorney or procurator in the case during the time of their

office; if they have altogether withdrawn from their office, they may be admitted, but their testimony has merely corroborative force; (3) persons who at any time held the office of judge in the case (Canon 2027).

How anxious the Church is to get all possible information on the life and character of the servants of God in beatification proceedings is evident from the rule of the Code that permits those persons to testify who are not considered qualified in many other cases pending in ecclesiastical courts, as may be seen from Canons 1756-1758. The confessor is barred from testifying concerning everything which he knows from sacramental confession, even though the penitent had given him permission to speak of certain things mentioned in confession and freed him from the obligation of secrecy concerning those things. The confessor who lived in the same house with the servant of God, as would happen in religious communities, and who would therefore know a great deal of the life and character of the servant of God altogether apart from confession, could be a witness. Whether it is advisable to call him as a witness is a question for the beatification court to decide. It is our opinion that, if there are sufficient other witnesses to testify to the life and character of the person, the confessor should not be called because of the difficulty he may have in separating in his mind the facts known through confession from those known in the ordinary course of community life.

It is quite natural that the law of the Code bars the postulator, or vice-postulator, attorney and procurator from testifying in the case so long as they hold those offices. Even after they have ceased from office, their testimony is not given the same value as that of other witnesses because they are considered interested parties (*i.e.*, persons who are anxious to gain for the servant of God the honor of beatification). That the judge or the judges in the beatification case should not be permitted to act as witnesses, even after they have actually ceased to act in that capacity in the case, is easy to understand, for a great deal of the information which they have obtained is subject to their oath of secrecy, and besides, the information which they had personally and what they obtained in their official capacity would be difficult to separate in their minds.

Physicians as Witnesses in Miracles

Physicians who gave medical care to the person on whom a miracle is said to have been performed must be introduced as witnesses when there is question of miracles. If they refuse to appear in court, the judge shall procure at least a written and sworn statement about the illness and its course, which is to be inserted in the acts of the case, or he shall have their opinion taken by a person appointed for that purpose, and that person shall afterwards be examined (Canon 2028).

Physicians can ordinarily testify better than other persons concerning an illness from which some one claims to have been cured by the intercession of a servant of God. Great precaution is necessary when there is question of a miraculous cure, and the Sacred Congregation of Rites is very rigorous in its investigation concerning miracles in cases of beatification and canonization. Medical men are naturally cautious in asserting that a cure in a given case could not have been effected in any other manner than by divine intervention. If a physician does not want to testify under oath, an opinion at least should be got from him concerning the cure, for the Holy See wants all available information to assist it in forming its judgment on the difficult question whether a cure is a miracle.

Essentials of Testimony from Personal Knowledge

In their testimony, the witnesses must state the reason for their personal knowledge of the things they assert; otherwise their testimony shall not be considered as of any value (Canon 2029).

This short paragraph is of great importance, for unless the court takes care to inquire at the examination of a witness why he claims to know from personal knowledge what he asserts, the testimony is of no value. If a witness is presented as an eyewitness, and does not attest that he knows the facts because he was present and heard or saw what was going on, the testimony is deficient. The promoter of the faith, whose business it is to prepare the questions which the judge is to put before the witnesses, must frame the questions in a manner to ascertain the reason why a witness claims the facts stated by him to be true.

Witnesses from the Religious Organization of which the Servant of God was a Member

To prove the reputation for sanctity or the martyrdom of a servant of God who belonged to some religious organization, it is necessary that at least one-half of the number of witnesses be persons outside such organization (Canon 2030).

This rule seems to be based on the supposition that the members of the community to which the servant of God belonged are liable to be prejudiced either in favor of or against the person with whom they lived. Experience does indeed prove that in intimate contact with others likes and dislikes develop which are not always based on sound reason and truth. In any case, it is practically necessary to get a variety of character witnesses to obtain a complete knowledge, so far as humanly possible, of the life and character of a person.

Testimony of Experts

When there is need of the testimony of experts, the following rules shall be observed:

(1) there must be at least two experts, who shall be unknown to each other, and they shall make the investigation as pointed out in n. 4 of this Canon;

(2) they shall be appointed either by the court by a plurality of votes after consultation with the promoter of the faith, or, if they are to act for the Sacred Congregation, by the Cardinal *Ponens* after consultation with the Promoter General of the Faith. Those who have been witnesses in the cause must be always excluded from acting as experts:

(3) the postulator shall not be informed of the persons chosen as experts, and the experts shall keep their appointment secret;

(4) the experts shall make their investigations individually and separately, unless the judge for a good reason, and with the assent of the promoter of the faith, allows them to institute their investigations jointly;

(5) each expert shall give a written report of his individual investigation; then they shall be separately questioned, even though they conducted the investigation jointly (Canon 2031).

Experts are not witnesses in the proper sense of the term; they are men who assist the court with their technical knowledge con-

cerning matters which require study into the facts submitted by witnesses. In beatification cases there may be need of the assistance of experts—for instance, to determine whether a letter, sermon, or other manuscript presented as the writing of the servant of God is really his handwriting; in miracles which have been testified to by witnesses, investigation into the nature of the illness or the recovery may have to be made by men who are specialists in that particular field. Experts are not to be introduced by the postulator but are to be chosen by the court. The Church wants a disinterested opinion of the experts on matters submitted to them by the court.

Documents Submitted in the Beatification Process

The documents on which the postulator relies must be submitted to the tribunal in complete form. The tribunal may also demand from the postulator other documents which in the judgment of the court may serve to reveal the truth (Canon 2032).

Extrajudicial testimonies made in writing, whether by persons whom the postulator had presented to the court to testify on the virtues or the martyrdom of a servant of God, or by other persons whom the postulator proposed as witnesses, may not, even though presented in the processes, be counted among the documents which in the judgment of the sanctity or the martyrdom of a servant of God have the force of proof. Nor do eulogies at the funeral and necrologies written or printed immediately after the death of a servant of God constitute legitimate proof. Much less do the testimonies of men, no matter how illustrious, prove anything regarding the virtues and works of a servant of God, if they were written, not spontaneously, but at the request of friends during the lifetime of the servant of God (Canon 2033).

Ordinarily the holiness of life or the martyrdom is to be proved by eyewitnesses who testify before the beatification tribunal. Written statements of persons who can appear before the court and be examined under oath are not to be presented as documents. Neither are eulogies and necrologies written or printed immediately after the death or funeral of a servant of God considered documents that prove what is said there about the person. Much less do things written in praise of a person during his lifetime at the request of friends prove anything, and such writings should not be presented

as documents. So long as there are a sufficient number of persons living who can testify as eyewitnesses to the sanctity of life or to the martyrdom, such testimony is preferred to documents.

The Code continues: Histories do not have the value of documents, unless they are based on documents which have been presented in the process. If some men of great authority have made use of documents now exhibited in the cause and have approved of them, their testimony can be adduced merely to confirm the authenticity and authority of the documents (Canon 2035).

Historical documents, whether in manuscript or printed form, by which the postulator endeavors to prove the virtues of a servant of God or the antiquity and uninterrupted continuation of the cult given to him, shall be inserted in the acts of the process, forwarded to the Sacred Congregation, and examined by experts. If, however, any of these documents be kept in a library or in archives from which they cannot be removed, a copy or a photoprint shall be made with the written testimony of the notary of the tribunal as to its authenticity. If this also cannot be done, the matter shall be referred to the Sacred Congregation, which shall appoint experts to examine the documents in the place where they are preserved (Canon 2036).

Canon 2049 prescribes that the first or informative process of beatification be begun by the local Ordinaries not later than thirty years from the death of a servant of God. The reason for this rule is evident, for if too many years elapse after the death until the beatification process is begun, many of the people who were acquainted with the person's life and character or with the circumstances of his martyrdom will have passed away, and little or no testimony from personal knowledge could be obtained. The Church has permitted the beatification proceedings in cases of saintly persons who died so many years ago that there is no possibility of obtaining eyewitnesses. In those cases the rules on historical documents are of importance, since they are necessary to get sufficient information on the life or the martyrdom of a servant of God.

Process of Beatification by the Way of Non-Cult

The judges, promoter of the faith and sub-promoters, the notary and his assistant, who participate either in the processes conducted

by the authority of the local Ordinary or in those conducted by delegates of the Holy See, must at the beginning of every process take an oath according to the formula prescribed by the Sacred Congregation that they shall discharge their office faithfully, shall keep the secret until the publication of the process, and shall not accept donations of any kind.

The Ordinary, though not acting as judge, is nevertheless bound to take the oath to keep secrecy.

Besides the oath of secrecy, the witnesses must before examination take the oath to tell the truth, and, after they have given testimony, the oath as to the truth of the statements made; no witness is excepted or dispensed from these oaths. Experts, interpreters, revisers, and copyists must take the oath to discharge their offices well, before they enter on their duties, and, after they have done their work, they must affirm under oath that they have faithfully done their duty. The messenger also shall take the oath that he will perform his work faithfully.

The postulators and vice-postulators must take the *iuramentum calumniæ*—that is, swear that they shall speak the truth throughout the entire process and shall not act fraudulently in any manner.

In processes before the Sacred Congregation, its own proper law as to the taking of oaths shall be observed (Canon 2037).

In Canons 1999-2036 are stated the general rules on beatification and canonization. After these, the special rules for the various processes or parts of the whole procedure of beatification and canonization are laid down. And first, there is the process of beatification by the way of non-cult which is divided into the ordinary process instituted by authority of the bishop, and the Apostolic process which the Holy See orders the bishop as delegate of the Holy See to institute after the approval of the ordinary process. Canon 2037 prescribes that the persons who take part in the beatification proceedings pronounce an oath, which varies in form according to the duties which the persons have to perform. If the local Ordinary does not in person preside over the beatification proceedings, he appoints one delegated judge and two associate judges to take his place. There are three sections to the whole beatification procedure in the *processus ordinarius* or *informativus* instituted by authority of the local Ordinary for the information of the Holy See: (1)

the process concerning the writings of the servant of God; (2) life and character, reported miracles, martyrdom; (3) the non-cultus process to prove that there has been no public ecclesiastical cult given to the servant of God. In the beginning of each of these processes, the bishop, the judges, promoter of the faith, notary and the postulator must take an oath. The bishop may issue a special mandate to the vicar-general to take his place in the beatification processes. The various forms for the oaths and the formalities of the sessions of the beatification tribunal are not given in the Code of Canon Law, but must be obtained from other sources dealing specially with this matter—as, for instance, the *Codex pro Postulatoribus,* published by the Postulator General of the Order of Friars Minor. In the next issue we shall describe the first of the three processes mentioned, the process on the writings of a servant of God.

PREJUDICE

By A. J. Carmody

The town was in the throes of an anti-Catholic campaign. An organizer for a national secret society had been plying his trade, and his impassioned pleas to save the country from the Pope had whipped into a frenzy of bigotry a large proportion of the population. Though his words took more effect upon the less influential element of the community, even the more respected citizens were also drawn into the movement either through desire for gain or fear of loss in their respective trades and professions.

In the midst of the campaign a monster night meeting was held in the local armory, where the customary inflamed speeches were made. At its conclusion, as the crowd was pouring into the street, I happened to be passing nearby and was subjected to some rough remarks about the priesthood and insulting personal epithets. Though these hurt nothing more substantial than my feelings, yet my anger boiled up, for young blood runs hot and demands condign satisfaction for personal injury. However, considering the circumstances and the disparity of numbers, it seemed prudent to postpone my demand for such satisfaction; so I could do no more than to fume inwardly as I walked disconsolately home.

On entering the rectory I found the Old Missionary in his study contentedly enjoying his pipe and a book. He appeared at peace with the world in general and entirely unaware of the great danger which threatened the local church and clergy. On him, I judged, I might rightly expend my pent up emotions.

"Something must be done, and that immediately," I hotly declared, "or we will be driven out of town entirely. We are asleep and bigotry is running rampant. We too should have meetings and speakers; we too should use the newspapers. All this prejudice can be overcome, if we take the proper means to get a public hearing. Our present neglect in this matter is criminal."

My words were a thinly veiled indictment of my pastor. Later on I was to be sorry and ashamed for having spoken them. Even then I felt in a degree their injustice, for I was well aware that the old priest had the situation fairly well in hand. With the advice and help of a committee of representative laymen, he had taken prudent means for the protection of the church; he had the parish united be-

hind him in whatever measures he deemed necessary to take in the defense of religion; further developments were being awaited. But the measures adopted were in no way spectacular; there were no great public demonstrations, no wide show of the punitive power of the Church. All this brought small satisfaction to me, for when one is hurt publicly no sweeter balm can be applied to the wound than public triumph over the enemy.

Though my words certainly contained a hidden sting, the Old Missionary did not seem greatly to resent them. Their only visible effect was to cause him to lay aside his book and reach for a match to light his pipe. In fact, his first words referred to a subject far afield from the one occupying my mind.

"I believe that the 8 o'clock Mass began a little late this morning," observed the old man.

I had the grace to blush. The night before I had attended a social gathering and did not get home and to bed until far into the morning. My sleep was not broken until I was awakened by the five-minute bell before Mass. It was only by some quick work in dressing that the congregation was not held long waiting. The Old Missionary seeing my confusion did not pursue the matter further. He returned to the original discussion.

"What you say concerning the need of making known our faith is true. It must be spread by every legitimate means at our disposal, not only in a crisis as now but at all times. Nevertheless, I can't quite agree that prejudice is to be overcome by such natural means alone. For in my experience I have found that prejudice has its source not only in the intellect but also in the will of man. To both must the appeal be made."

By this time I was in a much better humor and able to view matters in a more rational light. Since the Old Missionary had spoken of his "experience," I considered that there might be a story in the offing. After a few leading questions on my part the old priest began to speak, first haltingly and then fluently of his missionary past.

"In the old mining camps prejudice, not only of a religious nature but of any kind, was practically unknown. Since men from every walk in life and previous condition were thrown together as companions, no embarrassing questions were asked. It was only de-

manded that a man subscribe to the simple rules of primitive justice by which the camps were governed. Such was the custom of the early days. When civilization began to make its influence felt, conditions soon changed. Parties and cliques were formed and members of these looked askance at strangers to their organizations. With the building of churches religious prejudice also entered to divide the community.

"You may believe that in my time I have had much experience with bigotry. Since my ordination I have felt the effects of every national anti-Catholic movement and others of only local importance. In fact, I saw my missionary territory change from fullest tolerance to blackest prejudice. Respect for the Church was turned into derision; where the priest was once received with honor, he found only suspicion. Naturally, such a radical change in community sentiment was the source of great regret to me. So, though my mission was my first love, yet I welcomed an opportunity to go elsewhere. Since my health had been somewhat affected, the Bishop offered me, at least temporarily, a much more improved parish. The former pastor had gone to Europe and might not return. His Lordship suggested that I at least make a trial of it.

"My new parish, for the time and the diocese, was of a high standard. I found facilities there to which I had in no way been accustomed. The community was for the greater part Catholic and quite prosperous; the church was a substantial and imposing structure; there was a comfortable rectory and even a Sisters' school. Certainly all this was most remarkable to a priest used to the makeshifts of the missions. I could not, however, divorce myself entirely from the welfare of my old parish, so in coming to my new charge I brought a certain section of the mission with me. I have perhaps not mentioned before the fact that there was an Indian reservation in my territory. The members of the tribe occupying it were mostly Catholic; but contact with the whites was fast dissipating their faith. I thought it a great opportunity to bring with me several of the children and give them a religious education in the Sisters' school. On their return to the reservation they would be a tremendous help toward preserving the faith of the tribe at large.

"Need I say that my new home was very pleasant to me? I revelled in the unaccustomed conveniences of a well organized parish;

I gratefully experienced the kindness of the people. But it was not long until I felt a contrary spirit arise in the community. A subtle feeling of dissatisfaction began to manifest itself among the parishioners and soon broke out into the open. A grievance committee put in their appearance at the rectory. The committee did not mince words but came directly to the point at issue. They made it plain that the new pastor was acceptable to them, and they would like nothing better than for him to retain permanent care over them. The Indian children were a different matter. These were not wanted in the school as associates of the white children. These 'foreigners' must be dismissed.

"My first reaction was the resolve to order the protesters from the rectory; but on second thought I refrained. Further conversation brought out the viewpoint of the committee; it had elements of justice. The church and school had been built with much sacrifice by the members of the parish; these institutions existed for them and for their children. The committee had no quarrel with the aborigines, but considered them best kept on the reservation. At least the parish did not feel bound to offer them a sanctuary. In short, they must go.

"The case of the committee was well put and had its merits. I might have replied that all souls, no matter what their color, are equally precious in the sight of God and no distinction can religiously be made between them. The Church also has the duty of teaching every living creature. But the uselessness of words was apparent. Racial prejudice was riding high and would not be unseated. As gracefully as possible I accepted defeat and promised in due time to remedy the grievance.

"After communicating with the Ordinary I gathered my charges together and with them returned to the missions. I found that it is much easier to face the open bigotry of the enemy than the hidden prejudice of friends."

The Old Missionary took up his book and resumed his reading as if the whole subject, as far as he was concerned, was ended; but not so with me.

"Your story seems to bear out your contention," I said, "but still I place my hope of triumph over bigotry in publicity."

"That is all very well as far as it goes," replied the pastor. "I merely hold that it alone cannot displace prejudice. The good people of whom I spoke were well instructed, none better; but something was lacking to them. For want of a better name call it good will."

I tried one parting shot. "Let us return to the original question. What must we do here and now to stop our local campaign of bigotry?"

The Old Missionary cast in my direction a benign smile.

"If I were you," he advised, "I would retire early, get a good night's rest—and be up betimes for Mass tomorrow."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Does Sterilization of a Man Constitute a Diriment Impediment to Marriage?

Question: As more and more countries have in recent years enacted sterilization laws, it becomes of practical importance whether the sterilization of a man renders him unfit to contract a valid marriage. Will you kindly discuss this question in your REVIEW? SACERDOS.

Answer: The Catholic Church has always taught that sterility as such is not a bar to marriage. The traditional teaching of the Church is retained in the Code of Canon Law, which reads: "Sterility does neither invalidate nor impede marriage" (Canon 1068, §3). From the texts of the former Canon Law, from the teaching of the Scholastics (notably Sts. Thomas and Bonaventure), and from many of the best authorities on moral theology throughout the past centuries, we gather that sterility either natural or effected by artificial means does not incapacitate persons for marriage. To those of our readers who are interested in the study of this question we can recommend the carefully considered article of G. Arend, "De genuina ratione impedimenti impotentiæ," in *Ephemerides Theologicæ Lovanienses,* (January, 1932, pp. 28-69). It is well to bear in mind that his conclusions are not admitted by all theologians, but his discussion of the question is well reasoned and seems to be preferable to the opinion of his opponents. His understanding of the essential physical prerequisite for marriage is the ability to effect the sexual congress in a manner that it serves the secondary purpose of marriage, the allaying of concupiscence.

There is a decision of Pope Sixtus V, June 27, 1587 (Gasparri, *Fontes,* I, n.161), which decrees that men who have had both testicles removed cannot contract a valid marriage. The principal reason given by the Supreme Pontiff seems to be the fact that they cannot perform the sexual act in a manner that serves the secondary purpose of marriage, the allaying of the concupiscence of the flesh. This decision is applied by some theologians to those men who have been sterilized by vasectomy or some similar operation. The Code of Canon Law was compiled in recent times, and the Holy See could not have been ignorant of the fact that at the time the sterilization of men was decreed by the laws of some countries; nevertheless, we have the rule in the Code that sterility neither invalidates nor impedes marriage. So long as a sedative copula is possible, the

secondary purpose of marriage is accomplished. The primary object of marriage, the procreation of offspring, is not possible with sterilized men, but neither is it possible with many men and women in advanced years, nor with a woman whose ovaries and womb have been removed; and yet the Holy See declared these persons capable of contracting marriage. Here we cannot enter upon a prolonged discussion of the question, and must refer our readers to the manuals of moral theology where at least in a brief form this question is discussed under the impediment of impotency.

Some Questions on Copyright

Question: Will you please answer the following questions: (1) several publishing houses have issued a warning against copying of their copyright material. To what extent do copyright laws oblige? (2) Is there any violation of justice to the extent of a sin? (3) Is the copying of music for some private choir, like that in a religious house, forbidden by the same law? (4) Is the copying of material for private memoranda forbidden? (5) Is there obligation to the extent of restitution? (6) In general, a law to be obligatory must be enforceable; when music is used by private persons and domestic choirs, how can this law be enforced? INQUIRER.

Answer: Before an invention, composition, and other products of the mind are published by their creator, it is certainly downright theft to take them or, even if the original is legitimately acquired, to publish them against the will of inventor, author or composer. Those things are more intimately the property of the person than the temporal goods which he has acquired through bodily labor. The right of the person to his mental productions is undoubtedly a right coming to him from the natural law. Once the invention or composition has been made public, it is not so clear from natural law that he retains the right of reproduction over those works of the mind. However, if the author complies with the rules of the government on copyright, patents, etc., and therefore obtains the right over the reproduction or use of the products of his skill, moralists are agreed that he has a strict right to what the law gives him, a right which must be respected in strict justice, for it is a property right. The civil law in this matter defines rights which are based on the natural law but are not sufficiently specific in that law. If man has a right to the fruits of his bodily labor, he should all the more have a right to the fruits of his mental exertions; but if reproduction and public use of an invention, composition, etc., were

no longer under the control of the inventor or author once it had been published, he would derive little or no profit from his mental labor. The right to sue in court for damages is but a consequence of the legal right acquired by copyright, patent, etc. The one who violates that right is in conscience bound to make restitution to the extent to which he has defrauded the publisher and author of the rights they have. On this point Catholic moralists are agreed, because they consider that fundamentally it is a natural right that the man has to the profits of his mental labor and the civil law merely makes the right specific and regulates its proper enjoyment.

There is no need of going to extremes in upholding anyone's rights. The making of a few copies of some piece of music or other copyrighted publication for use in a private family, or for that matter in any private circle (as for instance in a monastery, convent, academy), is not harming the author and the publisher to any extent. Music in churches, plays in parish halls and other public places should not be used except in conformity with the copyright laws. We must do to others what we in similar circumstances expect others to do to us—that is the law of Christ. Even though the copyrighted compositions, plays, etc., are to be used for religious or charitable purposes, this is no excuse for violating the copyright laws. The priest gets his salary working for the Church, and so should others get theirs unless they of their own free will donate their compositions, talents or services.

Not All Persons Exempted from the Form of Marriage Are Free from the Impediment of Disparity of Cult

Question: The Church has declared that children born of mixed marriages and of apostate Catholics are exempt from the Catholic form of marriage, if they were from infancy raised in heresy or without any religion, though they had been baptized in the Catholic Church. Does it suffice that one of the parents in an apostate, while the other is a practising Catholic? And furthermore, are those baptized as Catholics but raised from infancy outside the Catholic religion free from the diriment impediment of disparity of cult? Is their marriage to a non-baptized person valid in the same manner as the marriage of a non-Catholic to an unbaptized person is valid under Canon 1070, §1? PASTOR.

Answer: If in a marriage of two Catholics one only becomes an apostate and forces the non-Catholic education of the children from their infancy, even those baptized in the Catholic Church,

the children are very probably to be considered non-Catholics in reference to the form of marriage. The declaration of the Committee for the Authentic Interpretation of the Code merely states that children of apostate Catholics raised from infancy without the Catholic faith are to be considered non-Catholics when there is question of the form of marriage. It seems to suffice that one of the parents becomes an apostate, for then the situation is similar to the marriage of a Catholic to a non-Catholic, as is pointed out by *Periodica de Re Morali, Canonica, Liturgica,* XX, p. 78. One must bear in mind that the marriage of persons who have apostatized from the Church is not recognized by the Church, but their children who from infancy are raised without the Catholic faith are not to blame for their condition, and therefore the Church does not hold them to the ecclesiastical form of marriage.

Our correspondent asks whether children of mixed marriages and of apostate Catholics baptized in the Catholic Church but raised from infancy without the Catholic faith are free from the impediment of disparity of cult so that their marriage to a non-baptized person is valid. No, they are not free from that impediment and therefore their marriage to a non-baptized person is not valid in the eyes of the Church. It is important to remember that all who are baptized in the Catholic Church are subject to the rules of the Church; consequently, they are free only from those regulations of the Church from which she has declared them free. When the question of their marriage comes before the Church, either because they become converts to the Church or when after a divorce they want to marry a Catholic, their first marriage has to be judged in the light of this principle.

Mixing of Baptismal Water with Lourdes Water, Water from the River Jordan, or St. Ignatius Water

Question: Occasionally at the time of baptism of an infant the sponsors bring a small quantity of Lourdes water, or St. Ignatius water, or water from the River Jordan, and request that a few drops of this water be used with the baptismal water in the baptism of the child. May this request be licitly granted? SUBSCRIBER.

Answer: There may be a difference of opinion on this point, but it seems to us that to do what the people request is not free from some fault. The only addition of common water to the bap-

tismal water which the Church allows is for the purpose of increasing the amount of water needed for baptism. Nobody objects to the devotion people have towards the memory of the Lord's baptism in the Jordan, or towards our Lady of Lourdes, or towards St. Ignatius, but private devotion must stay in its place and not be mixed up with the liturgical services of the Church. The sacred liturgy for solemn baptism demands baptismal water and that water should not be tampered with. Besides, an element of superstition may easily be at the bottom of such requests rather than a true devotion. It looks as though the people thought the great Sacrament of Baptism is to be improved upon by such devotions.

Priests of Religious Organizations Cannot Be Appointed Diocesan Consultors

Question: You answered correctly about the secularized priests from religious communities that they could not be appointed as diocesan consultors, but I wanted to know whether religious priests working in a diocese may be appointed as diocesan consultors. SACERDOS.

Answer: The same decision of the Papal Committee for the Authentic Interpretation of the Code which declared that secularized religious could not be appointed diocesan consultors, also stated that priests of religious organizations cannot be appointed to that office (January 29, 1931; *Acta Ap. Sedis,* XXIII, 110). The diocesan consultors take the place of the cathedral chapter of canons, who act as a board of advisers or council to the bishop. The canons formed a kind of college or community, and recited the Canonical Hours of the Divine Office at the cathedral. They were secular priests, and are to be secular priests in the present legislation of the Church. Though Canon 423 (which speaks of the appointment by the bishop of diocesan consultors in places where a chapter of canons cannot be established) did not specifically say that they must be secular priests, the Committee for the Authentic Interpretation of the Code, in the above-cited declaration, assures us that secular priests only are eligible for that position.

Can Chaplains at Universities and Colleges Be Appointed with Full Parochial Jurisdiction?

Question: At many non-Catholic universities and colleges, especially at State universities, there are a goodly number of Catholics, and Catholic priests have been appointed by the bishops as chaplains of the Catholics at

those schools in order to save them from neglect of their religious duties and from the danger of indifferentism in religion. Is it possible under the law of the Code that those chaplains may be appointed with full parochial jurisdiction over the Catholics living on the school property?

CHAPLAIN.

Answer: There is no doubt that Catholic students at non-Catholic universities and colleges need special attention in reference to their religion, for they are in non-Catholic surroundings and away from the influence of their Catholic homes just in those years when temptations rush with their greatest force against the soul of the young man or woman. That is why our bishops have made great efforts to act on the exhortation of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore to provide Catholic schools for higher education. However, it is practically speaking impossible to have enough Catholic high schools, colleges and universities to accommodate all the Catholic young people. The next best thing that can be done is to have well educated and zealous priests to look after the Catholic students of secular colleges and universities.

Can those chaplains be appointed with full parochial jurisdiction over the Catholics living at such schools? The Code of Canon Law does not permit the establishment of personal parishes without a special papal indult (cfr. Canon 216, §4). The ordinary authority of the bishop of a diocese is limited to the establishment of territorial parishes. Can the territory of the college or university grounds be separated from other surrounding parishes and be made a parish of its own? There is no explicit rule in the Code concerning this point, but, considering that the Code permits the local Ordinaries in a somewhat analogous case to exempt religious houses and charitable institutions from the jurisdiction of the pastor in whose territory they are located and to appoint a priest with parochial jurisdiction over them, it would seem to be within the authority of the bishop to do the same with colleges and universities. Canon 1427 which speaks of the division and dismembering of parishes gives as canonical reasons for the separation of part of the territory of a parish: (1) great difficulty to go to the parish church; (2) too many parishioners so that even with the help of assistant priests the proper spiritual care is not possible. Since the old axiom, *salus animarum suprema lex,* is to be the guiding princi-

ple, it rests with the bishop to judge what is best for the spiritual care of the Catholic people in his diocese; and if he judges that the only practical way to take efficient spiritual care of the Catholics at the colleges and universities is to appoint a priest in charge with full parochial jurisdiction, it does not seem to be beyond his authority to do so.

An Instruction of the Holy Office to the Bishops of the United States, November 24, 1875 (*Collectanea de Prop. Fide,* II, n. 1449), urged them to provide Catholic schools for the elementary instruction as well as for the higher education. The dangers to the souls of Catholic children at non-Catholic schools coming from infidel textbooks and teachers, and from intimate association with young people many of whom have no principles of Christian faith or morality, should be offset by special efforts to instruct and guide the young people in the affairs of their religion.

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

Homiletic Part

Sermon Material for the Month of April

by Ernest Graf, O.S.B.

EASTER SUNDAY

The Resurrection

"You seek Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified: He is risen, He is not here, behold the place where they laid Him" (Mark, xvi. 6).

SYNOPSIS: I. The Resurrection a proof of Christ's godhead.
II. Christ truly dead; (b) and buried; (c) and risen.
III. The Resurrection an historical fact.
IV. The Apostles are its witnesses.
V. The proof of our own future resurrection; its model and pattern.

The Resurrection Our Lord's Greatest Miracle

Easter Day sets God's own seal upon Our Lord's work in this world. When all was over, on Good Friday, His friends laid His lifeless body in a cave scooped out of the hillside. So soon as the first streaks of dawn appeared over the Mount of Olives, He issued from the darkness of the tomb. It was the last and the greatest of a long chain of proofs by which He showed Himself to be truly the Son of God. St. Paul appeals to it in the opening lines of his greatest Epistle: "Who was predestinated—that is, shown to be—the Son of God in power, according to the spirit of sanctification, by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead" (Rom., i. 4).

In the course of His three years' ministry Jesus wrought countless miracles. The greatest of all His mighty deeds was His own resurrection. The miracle of Easter is the authentic proof of Christ's divinity, and of the supernatural heavenly character of the new religion founded by Him: "If Christ be not risen, your faith is vain. . . . Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished" (I Cor., xv. 17, 20).

From the all too scanty records of the Gospels and the Acts we gather that, if Our Lord tarried on earth for the space of forty days, it was chiefly in order to convince the disciples of the reality of His resurrection: "To whom also He showed Himself alive after His passion, by many proofs" (Acts, i. 3). He condescended so far as to take food with them, though a glorified body is in need of no nourishment; He allowed them not merely to look at Him, but to touch and handle Him, so that there should not remain the slightest doubt in their minds: "'See My hands and feet, that it is I Myself; handle and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see Me to have.' And when He had said this he showed them His hands and feet" (Luke, xxiv. 39, 40).

Christ Died on the Cross

Nothing is more certain than that Jesus Christ expired upon a gibbet. Even if we were to take the Gospel as no more than a human document, the death of Christ would be adequately established. The tragedy of Calvary is the climax of each of the four accounts of the Master's life. Profane history bears out and confirms the Gospel story. In the second century, St. Justin Martyr, in his *Apology* (or Defense of Christianity), refers his readers to the public records preserved in the imperial archives, in which the death of Jesus is recorded as having taken place under Tiberius.

The strongest proof of all is found in the preaching of the first heralds of the Gospel: "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews indeed a stumbling-block and unto the Gentiles foolishness" (I Cor., i. 23). Surely, unless Christ had really suffered and died on a cross, the Apostles would not have hopelessly compromised, at the very outset, any possible success of their preaching by proclaiming a dogma so shocking to the feelings of their hearers!

"Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, and . . . *He was buried*" (I Cor., xv. 3, 4). This insistence on the historical fact of Our Lord's death is not without purpose. It is necessary to establish it beyond doubt, since obviously the dogma of His resurrection rests on it. As a matter of fact, the heretics who denied His resurrection sought to found their error upon a denial of His death. Some of them pretended that Our Lord took only a semblance of our nature: hence both His death and His return to life would likewise be illusory. Others, and these in our own days, pretend that Jesus was taken down from the cross before He actually expired; hence His resurrection would be a mere awakening from a swoon.

Now, "Christ was dead and buried, and rose again," as we say in the Creed. He died of His own free will. No created power could take His life from Him; He could only die of His own will, and He was ready to lay it down (John, x. 17, 18). The Gospel tells us that Pilate wondered, when informed by Joseph of Arimathea that Jesus had expired. If His death had resulted solely from the tortures to which He had been subjected, it might not have ensued so quickly, for we read that in the case of the two men who had been crucified with Him the end had to be hastened by the additional cruelty of breaking their legs by smashing them with heavy clubs. But when the soldiers came to Jesus, "when they saw that He was already dead, they did not break His legs, but one of the soldiers with a spear opened His side . . . and he that saw it hath given testimony and his testimony is true" (John, xix. 33-35).

No doubt, therefore, is possible as to Our Lord's death. Moreover, an eyewitness describes how "they took the body of Jesus and bound it

in linen cloths, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury" (*ibid.*, 40).

The Resurrection a Fact of History

Our faith in Our Lord's Resurrection rests on a no less solid historical foundation. The Evangelists recount this marvellous event in exactly the same matter-of-fact way in which they relate other incidents in Christ's life. Nothing was further from their minds than the idea of foisting upon mankind a belief in a purely imaginary occurrence. If they had sought to impose upon human credulity, they would at least have taken the elementary precaution of comparing notes so as to make sure that their respective accounts should tally down to the last detail. But they did nothing of the kind. Hence the minor variations (not to call them differences) between the several Gospel narratives prove in their own way the authenticity of the event, for it is evident that each Evangelist wrote independently and in execution of his own personal plan or purpose.

Witnessed to by the Apostles

The Resurrection is a fact of history. From its very nature, there could be no eyewitnesses of the actual fact, but during forty days Christ Himself took steps to establish it. It is touching to watch the insistence which ends by convincing the Apostles. How patient He is with their slowness in believing! Their very joy at sight of Him caused them to doubt His return to life: it seemed too good to be true!

Once their own faith was established, the Apostles were not slow to realize that the Resurrection was indeed the rock on which Christianity is built. When they resolved to fill the vacancy created by the dreadful fate of Judas, Peter laid it down as an essential condition that the candidate should have been personally acquainted with the Master, for he was "to be made a witness with us of His resurrection" (Acts, i. 22). Thereafter the main theme of the apostolic preaching was the dogma of Christ crucified and Christ risen from the dead. Both events were necessary for our salvation. If Christ had not died for us, we should still be groaning under the intolerable burden of sin. Now, "Christ died for us . . . so that being now justified by His blood we shall be saved from wrath through Him" (Rom. v. 10).

St. Paul, the inspired preacher of Christ crucified (I Cor., i. 23), is a no less eloquent herald of the Risen Saviour. How emphatically he spoke in the synagogue of Antioch of Pisidia: there he told his Jewish audience how their coreligionists of Jerusalem, "when they had fulfilled all things that were written of Him, taking Him down from the tree, they laid Him in a sepulchre." But He did not remain shut up in the tomb, for "God raised Him up from the dead the third day." Nor was this wonderful thing based on mere gossip: on the contrary,

"He was seen for many days, by them who came up with Him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who to this present are His witnesses to the people" (Acts, xiii. 29-32).

Christ's Resurrection a Token of Our Own Return From the Grave

Our Lord's resurrection is a token, and a pattern of our own resurrection: "Christ is risen from the dead, the first fruits of them that sleep; for by a man came the resurrection of the dead. And as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive" (I Cor., xv. 20-23). In the mind of St. Paul our future resurrection is as certain as is Christ's resurrection. As He rose, so shall we be raised to newness of life. He died solely in order that He might give us life. In a manner of speaking, we are already dead and risen—dead, that is, to sin in baptism and thereby restored to a divine mode of existence. Baptismal regeneration is the surest token of a glorious immortality: "If we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection" (Rom., vi. 5). It follows that Easter Day is a day of joy and thanksgiving. From the earliest days of the Church this day has been joyfully kept as the chief festival of the whole year: "The Pasch of the Lord . . . for us this is the festival of festivals, the solemnity of solemnities, excelling all others even as the sun excels the stars" (St. Gregory Nazianzus, *Sermo I in Pasch.*).

Faith in a future resurrection gives new meaning and fresh purpose to life; it lights up its gloom and transfigures its dullness. How tragic would be our existence were it to be rounded off finally by death! "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable" (I Cor., xv. 19). Faith in Christ and acceptance of His law lay manifold restrictions upon our liberty, restrictions that are often galling to flesh and blood. Christanity is made up of so many *don'ts* and so many *thou shalts!* The world fails to yield all that the heart longs for. Justice, on the other hand, demands that there should be compensation or retribution for the anomalies of this present life. The body, moreover, is an integral part of human nature, sharing in the good and the evil that men do and the good and ill fortune they are subjected to. Hence the body must share the everlasting lot of the soul.

Belief in a future resurrection is as old as the world. This faith was the stay and comfort of the early Christians. When one walks through the long corridors of the Catacombs, deep down in the soil of Rome, where our forefathers in the Faith have their sleeping places, one sees on practically every tomb a picture or an inscription expressing in lively fashion faith not merely in the survival of the soul, but an assured belief in the resurrection of the flesh. This is all the more

moving since so many thousands of those buried in the catacombs had undergone exquisite torture and death for Christ.

Easter always falls in the springtime of the year. In that season nature herself is, so to speak, in sympathy with its Author, for it shakes off the torpor of winter and bursts into flower and leaf. We may well look upon the annual miracle of spring as a true, if faint, image of the greater miracle by which, at the end of time, the earth and the sea shall give up their dead (Apoc., xx. 13).

> Lo! the graciousness of the world new-born
> Attests that all things are risen with their Lord,

says the fine old hymn which our brethren of the Middle Ages were wont to sing in procession before the Mass of Easter Sunday (Hymn *Salve, festa dies!*).

As we look up to the resplendent Figure of our glorious King on this day of His victory over death, let us rejoice with Him in this hour of triumph, and let our hearts beat high in the knowledge that His victory is ours likewise. Even as *He* rose, so shall *we*. And as He rose with the same human nature, but henceforth endowed with new splendors, so shall we be transformed into His likeness, provided we are dead to sin and live in Him and for Him.

LOW SUNDAY

The Sacraments

"Whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the world, and this is the victory which overcometh the world, our faith" (I John, v. 4).

SYNOPSIS: *I. Sacraments link us to the Passion.*
II. Meaning of the word.
III. Sacraments are instrumental causes of grace.
IV. Composed of matter and form.

The Sacraments and the Passion

If the Resurrection of Our Lord is to prove for all of us a pattern of our own future glory, we must first appropriate and, as it were, assimilate the fruits of His blessed Passion: "If we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection" (Rom., vi. 5). The Passion is the unfailing and unique source and cause of justification and supernatural rebirth, for, says St. Paul, "He hath quickened you together with Him, forgiving you all offenses, blotting out the handwriting of the decree that was against us, which was contrary to us, and He hath taken the same out of the way, fastening it to the cross" (Col., ii. 13, 14).

It may prove helpful to visualize the Passion as it were like a vast,

inexhaustible reservoir, or better still as an unfathomable ocean of grace and blessings for all mankind. These blessings flow through the whole world like calm, majestic rivers, in the seven Sacraments of the New Law. The Sacraments are the authentic channels by which we are brought in living contact with Our Saviour, even though so many centuries separate us from the blessed days when men and women like ourselves were privileged with their eyes to behold and with their hands to handle the Word of Life (I John, i. 1).

Redemption, salvation, sanctification imply contact with the Redeemer, the Saviour, the Sanctifier. In the days of His mortal life Our Lord's miracles of healing and pardoning were usually accompanied either by physical contact with His person or, at least in the latter instance, by some words spoken by Him. Jesus Christ, as God made Man, is the sole source of health and life for "in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead corporeally" (Col., ii. 9). However, now as then a virtue proceeds from Him only when we touch Him with the hand of faith. Hence, though inwardly charged with divine energy, the Sacraments profit only such as believe in their virtue and in their power to link us to Christ and to His Passion.

Meaning of a Sacrament

There is something sacred and awe-inspiring about the very name by which we designate the divinely appointed means of grace. Sacrament (*sacramentum*) originally meant an oath, more particularly the oath by which a soldier swore loyalty to his colors. At all times an oath implied an invocation of the deity. Christianity, which baptized not only men but likewise their speech, gave fresh dignity to the word when it chose it to designate the holy and most venerable symbols and tokens, visible and tangible, which Jesus Christ Himself chose as the vehicles of His grace.

The use of signs and symbols is natural to man. Symbols or signs may be natural or artificial and conventional. Thus, smoke is a natural sign or symbol suggesting the idea of fire, which is its natural and ordinary cause. On the other hand, a branch of laurel or olive is only a conventional symbol of victory and peace. Certain signs are not mere symbols or tokens: they effect and produce that which they signify. Thus, dark clouds are both a token of rain and its cause. The Sacraments belong to the latter class of signs. They do much more than point to or hint at grace: they are its efficient cause, inasmuch as they are so many instruments or tools in the hand of Christ and His priests.

The Council of Trent makes its own, after expounding it, St. Augustine's definition of a Sacrament. The latter says that "a Sacrament is a sign (in the sense explained above) of a sacred thing." The Council

declares that it is "a visible sign of an invisible grace instituted for our justification" (cfr. "Catech. of Trent," tr. by McHugh & Callan, p. 143). Hence Christ alone could and did institute the Sacraments, for He is "the author and finisher of our faith" (Heb., xii. 2), "in whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of sins" (Col., i. 14).

A Sacrament is, therefore, essentially a material and sensible token or symbol pointing to and issuing in a spiritual, supernatural reality—that is, grace. This is not to say that every component element or part of the sign must needs be visible and tangible in itself. Thus, in the Holy Eucharist the flesh and blood of Christ are the token and cause of grace, though they are not visible in their own nature but are hidden under the sensible properties of bread and wine which are the only sensible elements of this greatest of Sacraments. In Penance, in which sorrow or repentance is one of the elements, its presence is only manifested by the humble accusation of his sins by the penitent. The purpose of every Sacrament is the sanctification of men's souls. Hence it is a continuation and extension through the ages, though under changed conditions, of the redemptive work that Our Lord carried out in His own person during the days of His mortality.

Nature of the Causality of the Sacraments

It would be a pitiful dwarfing of Christ's wonderful Sacraments if we denied to them a real, inherent virtue and efficacy. They are indeed far more than mere occasions or pretexts, so to speak, for a display of Christ's liberality by a direct, personal intervention on His part. Ultimately He is, of course, the true source of grace and holiness, for "of His fullness we all have received, grace upon grace" (John, i. 16). It is, however, in keeping with all we know of Him that rites, gestures, or words used by Him personally or prescribed by Him for future use by the Apostles and the Church generally, should produce and effect that which they hint at or signify. There never was the slightest sham or make-believe in anything Our Lord said or did.

So theologians attribute to the Sacraments a causality which they call *instrumental.* An instrument, or tool, possesses a very real virtue, though that virtue must remain inoperative until the tool is used by a higher agent. The edge of a knife and the teeth of a saw are able to cut or to tear up wood or suchlike substances. But they can only do so if wielded by the hand of man. On the other hand, without such an instrument a workman would not be able to cut or saw whatever it is desired to divide or break up. The woodman, therefore, is the primary agent; the knife or saw the secondary and instrumental one. But it is plain that in its own order or sphere the tool is endowed with a very real and efficient causality, though one whose exercise is de-

pendent on an agent of a higher order. A Sacrament is an instrument or tool in the hand of Christ, or in the hand of those to whom Christ has deigned to communicate something of His omnipotence. The efficaciousness of these divine instruments is independent of the moral goodness of the minister, but to produce their effect they demand at least faith in the recipient and the removal of such obstacles as make divine friendship impossible.

There is, therefore, a twofold virtue in the Sacraments, the one inherent in the sacred sign or symbol, the other dependent, in part at least, on the dispositions of the recipient. This fruitfulness of the Sacraments is aptly described in two technical phrases, *ex opere operato, ex opere operantis:* that is, the effect of the Sacrament is the result both of the faithful carrying out of the rite as instituted by Christ and of the dispositions of the soul of the recipient.

That all the Sacraments are invested with a positive, intrinsic efficaciousness is rightly inferred from what Our Lord Himself says of Baptism: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John, iii. 5). St. Paul speaks with no less emphasis of Christ's love of the Church, for which He delivered Himself "that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life" (Eph., v. 25, 26).

Whilst not excluding but rather supposing certain suitable dispositions on the part of the recipient, these texts state in unmistakable terms that the supernatural effect of purification and sanctification is not merely hinted at, or pointed to, by the ceremonial washing of baptism. On the contrary, this spiritual cleansing is the direct effect of the ceremony—*the word of life* (that is, the living, quickening word of Christ) imparting to the element of water a power which it does not naturally possess. The same principle holds good with regard to every other Sacrament.

Matter and Form

Material elements, such as water, oil, bread (even actions such as the laying-on of hands), are not in themselves sufficiently definite tokens or signs of any higher virtue or significance than that which they possess of their nature. Hence these things are, as it were, the raw material of the Sacraments: in fact, theologians call them the *matter* of the Sacraments. This matter only becomes charged with supernatural virtue when the *form* (that is, certain words) gives them specific significance and divine purposefulness. This is admirably expressed in St. Augustine's well-known saying: "Leave aside the word, and what is water but water? Let the word be added to the element and it becomes a Sacrament" (*Tract. lxxx in Joan.,* 3). In his letter to the Armenians, Pope Eugene IV writes as follows: "Three things

are required for a Sacrament: a material object as its matter, words as its form, the minister who performs it with the intention of doing what the Church intends thereby; should any of these three elements be missing no Sacrament is administered" (Denzinger, n. 695).

This wonderful linking of divine grace to such lowly elements as water, oil, and so forth, is in admirable harmony with a composite nature such as that of men. The most spiritual thing in man is his faculty of acquiring knowledge. Yet all our knowledge, even our highest spiritual intuitions and perceptions, have their roots in matter first perceived by the senses of the body. Our body also develops and waxes strong by assimilating such products of the soil as are suitable for human nutrition. Our Lord's action, therefore, was in keeping with our nature when He chose to link His grace, which constitutes the soul's higher life, to material and terrestrial elements: "If man were not clothed with a material body," St. John Chrysostom aptly comments, "these things (*i.e.*, grace) would have been presented to him naked and without any covering; but as the soul is joined to the body, it was absolutely necessary to employ sensible things in order to assist in making them understood" (*Hom. lxxxii in Matt.*, 4).

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

Baptism

"Who His own self bore our sins in His body upon the tree, that we, being dead to sin, should live to justice" (I Peter, ii. 24).

SYNOPSIS: I. Baptism is the Gate of Life.
II. Its nature and effects.
III. An essential means of salvation.
IV. Matter and form; the minister; sacramental character.

The Gate of Life

Is there a more dramatic and more moving scene than that which may be witnessed almost daily in any one of our churches? A tiny child is brought to the door of the sacred edifice? It is but a few days old; nay, if it is a very fortunate child and its parents are truly enlightened, it may be but a few hours old. Vested in surplice and stole, the priest goes forth to meet the newcomer. Though the child is unable to have a thought or to utter it, the priest puts to it a most momentous question:

"What askest thou of the Church of God?"

"Faith."

"What does faith give to thee?"

"Life everlasting."

Baptism is the Sacrament of faith, and hence also the gate of the kingdom of God. Faith is the indispensable preliminary, but baptism also is required: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mark, xvi. 16). It is impossible to ascertain at what time Our Lord instituted this first and essential sacrament, but He made it compulsory in the last hour of His life in this world. Standing in the midst of the small group of loyal disciples who had accompanied Him to the sun-lit plateau of the Mount of Olives from which He was about to ascend into the sky, Jesus laid upon them a truly stupendous task. "Going into the whole world, teach ye all nations," He said, "baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt., xxviii. 19). The command is formal and universal, suffering no exception. Long before this supreme injunction Christ had insisted on the reception of baptism as a condition of admission into His kingdom. "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of God," He said to Nicodemus (John, iii. 5).

Nature and Effects of Baptism

The nature as well as the effects of baptism may be gathered from the names by which it is variously designated. St. Paul speaks of it in terms of: (a) *regeneration;* (b) *burial;* (c) *illumination.*

(a) Christ saved us, says the Apostle, "by the laver of regeneration and renovation of the Holy Ghost . . . that being justified by His grace we may be heirs . . . of life everlasting" (Tit. iii. 5, 7). In the New Testament we meet again and again with this expression, *regeneration* or *new birth.* The entire process by which men are justified and made acceptable to God is described in terms of birth or generation: "Unless a man be born again. . . ." Nor is it difficult to perceive the singular appropriateness of the metaphor, for metaphorical the language is. Sanctifying grace is the true life of the soul. In the almost incredible words of St. Peter, grace is nothing short of "a participation of the divine nature" (II Peter, i. 4). Nature is communicated by generation. Now, we are the children of God, not merely in name, but in truth and reality, says St. John (I John, iii. 1). Such a wonder can only be brought about if grace is indeed what St. Peter claims for it—a mysterious, inconceivable, though created, likeness to the very essence and nature of God. By it we are made like unto God; by it our will, nay our whole being, is brought into marvellous union and harmony with Him. Sin breaks up this harmony and friendship. It not only obscures the soul's likeness to God; it destroys it. Baptism is the natural and universal remedy against sin: "Do penance, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins" (Acts, ii. 38). Hence baptism is a bestowal

of the supernatural life. In the gorgeous ritual with which she consecrates the baptismal water on Holy Saturday, Holy Church compares the font to a womb giving birth to spiritual children, for she prays that "through a mysterious mingling of the Holy Ghost with the element of water a new race of men may be brought forth from the spotless womb of this divine font." In this way are men "born again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the word of God who liveth and remaineth for ever" (I Peter, i. 23).

(b) Baptism is also compared to a *burial* in which man dies and is buried to sin to the end that he may rise with Christ to a new and higher life: "Know you not that all we who are baptized in Christ Jesus, are baptized in His death? For we are buried together with Him by baptism; that as Christ is risen from the dead . . . so we also may walk in newness of life" (Rom., vi. 3, 4). The point and full force of this vivid imagery is only grasped when it is borne in mind that, in primitive times, baptism was almost exclusively administered by immersion. Three times, at the mention of each Divine Person, the catechumen disappeared under the water of regeneration. Thus did he die to his past, was buried *with* and *in* Christ, and as he emerged from the laver he entered upon a new life in which he so identified himself with Christ as to put Him on, so to speak, as a man puts on a garment. "As many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ" (Gal., iii. 27). Thus, in the words of the Church at the blessing of the font, this great Sacrament marks "the end of vice and the beginning of virtue."

(c) Baptism is an *illumination*. Reminding his converts from Judaism of the early days of fervor and persecution, St. Paul writes: "Call to mind the former days wherein being illumined you endured a great fight of afflictions" (Heb., x. 32). In Baptism the Holy Ghost lights in our soul the lamp of faith and the knowledge of divine truth, so that henceforth, "the eyes of our heart being enlightened, we may know what the hope is of His calling and what are the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints" (Eph., i. 18). This aspect of the Sacrament impressed itself more particularly upon the mind of the Eastern Church, in which baptism is called "Illumination," and the Feast of the Epiphany bears the title of "The Holy Lights" because of the Eastern custom of administering Baptism on that day with the same solemnity as on Holy Saturday. The reason of this custom lies in that on the Epiphany the Church honors not only Christ's manifestation to the nations, but likewise His first miracle at Cana and His baptism in the Jordan.

Baptism is Essential for Salvation

Salvation depends on our being incorporated in the mystical body of Christ, the Church. This is the purpose of the divine injunction to

the Apostles "to make all men their disciples" (such is the true meaning of the somewhat jejune *docete,* "teach ye all nations," of the Vulgate and an English Testament). Baptism sets us apart, marks us as Christ's own, in a mysterious yet very real manner makes us one with Him: "As many of you as are baptized, have put on Christ." Baptism is the seed or root of holiness which finally issues in everlasting life: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark, xvi. 16). Baptism blots out sin; but this admirable process is not a merely negative thing. Sin is washed away by the inrush into the soul of grace and holiness. Thus is spiritual death swallowed by life, and St. Paul's words are realized when he says that "in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcison, but a new creature" (Gal., vi. 15). Very properly, therefore, does the Catechism of Trent describe baptism as "the Sacrament of regeneration by water in the word."[1]

Matter and Form

In the terse but accurate definition of Trent we are taught what constitutes the Sacrament of Baptism and what are its effects. The very name Baptism indicates the sensible element chosen by Our Lord for this precious means of grace. Baptism means a washing with water, even a plunging of the whole body into the cleansing, refreshing element. Hence without water there can be no sacramental Baptism. What is called *baptism of blood* and *baptism of desire*—when a man dies for the faith ere he has been baptized, or in the impossibility of receiving it elicits either a positive desire for it or has at least such dispositions as amount to a real or implicit desire of baptism—is indeed able to cleanse the soul from sin and to incorporate it in Christ's mystical body, but those effects are not the result of the Sacrament; they are the fruit of faith and repentance and charity. The officer of the Queen of Ethiopia who heard the Gospel under circumstances so vividly told in the Acts, believed what his teacher told him, but he also grasped the need of baptism: "As they went on their way they came to a certain water; and the eunuch said: 'See, here is water: what doth hinder me from being baptized?' . . . And he commanded the chariot to stand still; they went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch: and he baptized him" (Acts, viii. 36 sqq.).

The *form* of the Sacrament is the life-giving words prescribed by Our Lord at the moment of the promulgation of the universal law of baptism as a condition of salvation. It consists in an explicit mention of the three Divine Persons. The Council of Nicæa commanded that any followers of Paul of Samosata who returned to the Church were to be baptized, because they had not been baptized in the name of

[1] Edited McHugh & Callan, p. 163.

the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost—but not the Novatians, because they made explicit mention of the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity when they baptized.

All Men, Even Children, Must Be Baptized

The law is clear and emphatic: "Teach all nations, baptizing them." What has been said of the *effects* of the Sacrament sufficiently shows its necessity. By it men die to sin and are born to a new life—a divine life. Now even little children come into the world deprived of sanctifying grace. This is the consequence of the fall and is call ***original sin.*** Though guiltless of personal sin, children are nevertheless deprived of the soul's supernatural life: they are dead and must be re-born. Hence the practice of the Church, from the beginning, of baptizing children as soon as possible. Even though the Gospel makes no explicit mention of children, the precept of Baptism for all sufficiently includes them and, as the Catechism of Trent rightly argues, the Divine Lover of the little ones would not withhold from them so great a grace. Circumcision was a figure of baptism. By it children were made members of God's peculiar people. The ceremony was performed eight days after birth. Baptism makes us members of Christ. Why should there be any delay in the conferring of so great a benefit? And though baptism implies a profession of faith in Christ—"What doth hinder me from being baptized? If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest . . ." (Acts, viii. 37)—children who cannot as yet make an act of faith do so by being made members of *the universal society of the Saints* whose faith suffices for the time being to enable them to receive spiritual regeneration. Origen[2] declares that "the Church has received from the Apostles the custom of given baptism to children." St. Cyprian's testimony is even more remarkable, for the great Bishop of Carthage takes side against another bishop who, because circumcision took place eight days after birth, wished to delay the Baptism of little children for a like number of days. As a matter of fact, Cyprian expresses not a personal opinion but that of sixty-six bishops of his province assembled in council. The Council of Trent clinches the matter by pronouncing its anathema against those who would refuse Baptism to children on the ground that they believe not with a personal faith but only with the faith of the Church.[3]

Belief in the doctrine of original sin should make priest and parents eager to see that children are baptized as soon as possible. At no time is the rate of human mortality higher than in the first days or weeks of life. Our Lord's words suffer no exception: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom

[2] *In Rom.*, v. 9.
[3] Sess. VII, Can. 13.

of God." "If thou wishest to be a Catholic," says St. Augustine, "beware lest thou believe, assert or teach that children dying before baptism are able to obtain the remission of original sin."[4] In these days of unbelief or diminished faith, even among some Catholics, this is deemed a hard saying. Let it be an incentive to Christian parents to have their little ones baptized as soon as possible. Many a mother who mourns the loss of a child that died without Baptism might have spared herself a lifetime of grief and self-reproach had she complied with the wishes of the Church rather than with the widely spread but deplorable custom of delaying Baptism for weeks.

The Minister of the Sacrament

Since Baptism is the most necessary Sacrament of all, its administration in case of necessity is by no means restricted to ordained priests. Anyone may then baptize—even a pagan or a Jew, provided he or she has the intention to do what the Church intends by the rite. This is in keeping with Our Lord's liberality as regards the matter of the Sacrament: water is the commonest of elements and any natural water is the lawful matter of the Sacrament, though from the earliest centuries the Church has always blessed the baptismal water with extraordinary pomp and solemnity, and only such water may be used in normal circumstances.

Sacramental Character

Baptism, like Confirmation and Holy Orders, does not only produce grace in the soul; it likewise leaves a definite, permanent impression upon it. This impression is called *character*—a mysterious power or habit by which the soul of the Christian is brought in contact with Christ as priest and source of all sanctification. *Baptism* enables us to receive the other Sacraments; *Confirmation* strengthens us and makes us warriors in Christ's cause; *Orders* enables men to become themselves priests and dispensers of the "good things" of Christ. The Fathers of Trent declare that St. Paul alludes to the sacramental character when he writes that "God hath anointed us, who also hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts" (II Cor., i. 21, 22). Character is more than the mere reception of the Sacrament, or the grace given by it. It is an abiding quality and an ornament of the soul for all eternity.

The day of our Baptism is a far more important date in our life than that on which we were born. Our birthday made us citizens of this perishable world; since the day of our Baptism St. Paul's words are true of us, too: "Now therefore you are no more strangers and foreigners, but you are fellow-citizens with the Saints and the domestics

[4] *De anima et ejus orig.*, iii, 12.

of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone . . . in whom you also are built together into an habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph., ii. 19 sqq.).

Realizing this, St. Louis, the great king of France, used to sign "Louis de Poissy," because he had been baptized in the parish church of that town. The holy king was wont to add: "At Paris I acquired the right of reigning in France, but at Poissy I won the right to reign one day in heaven."[5] A most excellent way of showing gratitude for the grace of Baptism is to renew frequently the promises we then made, or which our godparents made on our behalf. Best of all is it to strive to carry unsullied to the throne of God the robe of innocence of which the white garment of the baptismal ceremony is the touching emblem.

[5] Cfr. Duplessy, *"Histoires de Catéch."* (Téqui, Paris), III. p, 79.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

Confirmation

"I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims to refrain yourselves from carnal desires which war against the soul" (I Peter, ii. 11).

SYNOPSIS: I. Spiritual childhood and maturity.
II. Confirmation a true Sacrament.
III. Testimony of the Fathers.
IV. Matter and form.
V. Importance of Confirmation.

Spiritual Childhood and Maturity

Baptism is the Sacrament of a new birth. When we rise from the font we are "as newborn babes" (I Peter, ii. 2). Childhood has its unique charm and delights. For all that, we cannot always remain children, children even of a divine and supernatural world—we must "grow unto salvation" (*ibid.*). This growth unto spiritual maturity is the effect of the Sacrament of Confirmation. In primitive times the two Sacraments were conferred in immediate conjunction, Confirmation being the grand climax of the baptismal function. It is to be noted that quite recently a Decree has been issued by the Holy See, ordaining that henceforth Confirmation should be given at as early a date as possible in the life of a child—at the same time, practically, as that when it receives its First Communion. This is yet another wholesome return to the practice of early Christianity, bringing us in line with our fathers in the faith. St. Melchiades was Pope at the beginning of the era when Constantine gave peace to the Church. This is what

he writes: "All should hasten without delay to be born again unto God, and afterwards to be signed by the Bishop, that is, to receive the sevenfold grace of the Holy Ghost; for, as has been handed down to us from St. Peter, and as the other Apostles taught in obedience to the command of Our Lord, he who culpably and voluntarily, and not from necessity, neglects to receive this Sacrament, cannot possibly be a perfect Christian."[1]

Confirmation Is a True Sacrament

One reason why the Acts of the Apostles is a book of such absorbing interest is that in the opening chapters especially we see the Catholic Church at work in the days immediately following Our Lord's Ascension. It is reasonable to hold that the line of action of the Apostles in those early days was the result of a preconcerted plan. During the forty days during which Our Lord frequently conversed with them *of the kingdom of God,* among other things discussed were assuredly the Sacraments of the kingdom and the manner of administering them. The Old Dispensation was at an end, and the Temple itself with its gorgeous ritual was about to disappear. A new worship, new rites and new ceremonies had to be established. Without doubt all was done with the advice and under the guidance of the Master. Now, from the day of Pentecost onwards we see the Apostles baptizing, confirming and celebrating the Eucharist. The ritual observed by them, though exceedingly simple, was dignified and always the same.

In the Acts we read how the deacon Philip betook himself to Samaria where he preached "the kingdom of God in the name of Jesus Christ," and "they were baptized, both men and women." This news caused no small stir in the Holy City, for "when the apostles, who were in Jerusalem, had heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent to them Peter and John, who . . . prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost, for he was not as yet come upon any of them, but they were only baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Then they laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost" (Acts, viii. 12 sqq.).

In this lengthy text we see a clear distinction made between two Sacraments. Philip had baptized the Samaritans in the name of Jesus, that is, *with* the baptism prescribed by Jesus Christ. Even so, something was wanting to the new converts. Hence the head of the Apostolic college himself, with John, betook himself to Samaria. With prayer they laid their hands upon the converts and thus the neophytes received a further gift of grace. No one can doubt that the Holy Ghost was in their hearts already, since by grace we are the temple of the Blessed

[1] Cfr. McHugh & Callan, "Catech. of Trent," p. 200.

Trinity; but this presence does not imply the peculiar and specific gifts that result from the outpouring of the Holy Ghost—upon the Church as such on the day of Pentecost and ever since upon individual Christians on the day of their Confirmation, which is their own personal and intimate Pentecost. In the action of Peter and John at Samaria we have all the constituents of a Sacrament: (a) there is an external sign composed of matter and form, namely, prayer and the laying-on of hands; (b) grace is given, for the gift of the Holy Ghost is nothing else but the bestowal of grace (cfr. Rom., vi. 5: "the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost who is given to us"); (c) the divine institution is shown by the immediate result of the external rite, a result which the Apostles knew would ensue; had they not come from Jerusalem for the sole purpose of confirming the new converts? They acted as men do who know exactly what they are entitled to do and what is expected of them. Peter and John were not the inventors or originators of a new thing except in the sense that this may have been the first occasion on which they *confirmed;* what they did seemed to them quite natural and was accomplished in pursuit of Christ's injunction, which had appointed them "ministers of Christ and dispensers of the mysteries of God." (I Cor., iv. 1).

In those early days the bestowal of the Holy Ghost, whilst issuing in the first instance in an increase of sanctifying grace and the gift of strength and maturity which are of its essence, was often accompanied by certain lesser though far more striking symptoms, if the word be permissible. It was precisely these external phenomena which revealed to Simon the magician "that by the imposition of the hands of the Apostles the Holy Ghost was given" (Acts, viii. 18). An incident in St. Paul's missionary activities at Ephesus is no less enlightening. Here the Apostle found about a dozen disciples (*viz.*, believers in Jesus), who had only received the baptism of John. When "they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus," Paul "imposed his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them and they spoke with tongues and prophesied" (Acts, xix. 5, 6). However, these external phenomena were not universal; at any rate, not all Christians received all these gifts, which were granted not so much for the advantage of the recipient as for the general good of the Church. Miracles and supernatural phenomena were numerous when the Gospel was first preached, because it was necessary that the faithful themselves should be strengthened in the faith, and in order that the world might see with its own eyes the supernatural and divine character of the new religion. But an interior sanctification was ever the essential element of the rite. This is clearly hinted at by the expression, "they received the Holy Ghost," as explained above. This essential and unchanging element remains, though the *charismata,* as they are called, have ceased. All the same, the gift

of speaking in divers tongues and that of working miracles are by no means obsolete. When we see it in exercise in the lives of holy personages, we may quite simply put it down to the presence and action within and through them of the Holy Ghost received in Confirmation. As regards the gift of tongues, St. Augustine long ago remarked that that *charisma* is now exercised in a far better manner, since, the voice of the Apostles and their successors having gone forth into the whole world, every language and tongue praises the Lord and confesses that Jesus is the Son of God.

Testimony of the Fathers

Confirmation has always been held to be the complement of Baptism, though specifically distinct from it. Tertullian's words are very apposite: "In the next place (after Baptism) the hand is laid on us, invoking and inviting the Holy Ghost through the words of benediction. . . . Over our cleansed and blessed bodies willingly descends from the Father that Holiest Spirit."[2] St. Cyprian, commenting on the incident at Samaria spoken of in the foregoing paragraph, writes: "Because they had obtained a legitimate and ecclesiastical baptism, there was no need that they should be baptized any more, but that which alone was needed was performed by Peter and John, *viz.*, that prayer being made for them and hands being imposed, the Holy Ghost should be invoked and poured out upon them, which now too is done among us, so that they who are baptized in the Church are brought to the prelates of the Church, and by our prayers and by the imposition of hands, they obtain the Holy Spirit and are perfected with the Lord's seal."[3]

St. Gregory the Great admonishes bishops to visit even outlying districts of their dioceses, lest any who, by the mercy of God, are there baptized, should remain unsealed (*inconsignati*).[4] The latter word is arresting: it is practically identical with the word used today by the bishop as he anoints the forehead of the candidate for Confirmation. The story of St. Patrick in Ireland, St. Cuthbert in Northern England, St. Boniface in Germany, teems with instances of the zeal with which these Saints confirmed their converts.

Matter and Form

The *matter* of the Sacrament is the anointing with chrism—that is, oil mixed with balsam—and the imposition of hands. If the Acts of the Apostles and other early writers seem to stress the imposition of hands, it by no means follows that there was no unction. The imposition of hands may be identified with the unction, for obviously there can be no

[2] *De Bapt.*, viii.
[3] *Ep. lxiii ad Jubaianum*, 5
[4] *Ep. x*, 45.

anointing of the forehead without contact of the hand of the bishop. Since the anointing was universal in sub-Apostolic times, it stands to reason that it was introduced and practised by the Apostles.

The *form,* which points out the significance of the matter as used in the rite, is as follows: "I mark thee with the sign of the cross and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation: in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." We have here a reference to the thought of St. Paul who expressly compares the action of the Holy Ghost in the Christian soul to the impression created by a seal and permanently retained by the wax or other receptive substance: "He that confirmeth us . . . in Christ, and that hath anointed us, is God: who also hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts" (II Cor., i. 21, 22). As a matter of fact, this text seems to be written with design as a description of the spiritual effects of Confirmation.

By anointing the forehead in the form of a cross the Church wishes to impress her children with a vivid sense of the glory and power of the cross, so that they may glory in naught but the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ: "So far am I from blushing at the cross, that in no secret place do I keep the cross of Christ, but bear it on my forehead. Many Sacraments we receive, one in one way, another in another: some, as ye know, we receive with the mouth (the Eucharist); some we receive over the whole body (Baptism); but because the forehead is the seat of the blush of shame, He (Christ) set (in Confirmation), . . . so to speak, that very ignominy which the pagans mock at, in the seat of our shame."[5]

The stroke on the cheek—a reminiscence of the formalities with which the Romans of old were wont to set a slave at liberty—is meant as a warning and an exhortation to the new soldier of Christ. Confirmation is a call not to a soft life of slippered ease; it is a call to struggle, effort, suffering, and at times, perhaps, to death itself in the cause of the Kingdom.

Importance of Confirmation

Although Confirmation is not one of those Sacraments which are essential for salvation, there is a very real obligation for every Christian to receive it, inasmuch as the gift of the Holy Ghost expands, intensifies and deepens the supernatural life received in Baptism. In these days of unbelief and apostasy the children of the Church need this Sacrament of strength hardly less than the Sacrament of light (Baptism). When the present writer presented a recent convert to a holy and enlightened bishop, on hearing that the young man was about to go up to Oxford, the latter declared: "In that case I shall confirm you

[5] St. Augustine, *In Ps. cxli,* 9.

at once. At Oxford you will need all the strength of the Sacrament of the Holy Ghost."

This great Sacrament leaves an abiding mark or character upon the soul. Henceforth the Christian is enrolled as a warrior in the army of King Christ. Could there be more glorious knighthood than this? Whilst adding to our responsibilities, the new mark and character enable us to fulfill them. If we renew our baptismal promises frequently, let us not forget the grace of Confirmation. What St. Paul wrote to Timothy is applicable—with due proportion—to this Sacrament also: "I admonish thee, that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of my hands" (II Tim., i. 6).

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

Penance

"Let us go with confidence to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace in seasonable aid" (Heb., iv. 16).

SYNOPSIS: I. Excellence of Penance.
II. A virtue and a Sacrament.
III. Power to forgive sins given to priests.
IV. Confession.

The Sacrament of Penance is one of God's choicest gifts to mankind. But for this invention of omnipotent mercy the saving Blood of the Redeemer, as regards an enormous mass of Christians, would have flowed in vain. Penance is a plank thrown to those who have suffered spiritual shipwreck and death itself after baptismal regeneration. This Sacrament is likewise a most powerful factor for peace of heart and security of mind, inasmuch as it takes away the supreme obstacle to happiness, sin, for "who hath resisted Him and hath had peace?" (Job, ix. 4). Most appropriately was it instituted on the evening of the first Easter Day, for Penance is in very deed a restoration to health after sickness, a return to life from the chill of death.

Penance a Virtue and a Sacrament

(a) The meaning of the word "penance" deserves attention. Its general meaning is sorrow and grief, and, as a Christian virtue, it refers to sorrow for sin. Yet, Christian repentance can never stop at mere emotion, however good its nature and motive; to have moral worth sorrow must of necessity be accompanied by a sincere wish to make good the offense committed against God. This desire must be translated into the realm of reality by sorrow for the past, purpose for the future, and suitable acts of expiation. Such is the purport of the

exhortation of Joel (ii. 12, 13): "Be converted to Me with all your heart, in fasting, and in weeping, and in mourning. And rend your hearts and not your garments, and turn to the Lord your God." Taken in this sense, penance is a *moral* virtue, forming as it were a constituent element of the cardinal virtue of justice, and prompts us to make atonement, by acts of sorrow and expiation, for the offenses we have committed against God's majesty.

(b) As a Sacrament, Penance was instituted by Christ and is now used in the Church to be a remedy against grave sin committed after Baptism. That Christ did give power to men to forgive sin on earth follows clearly, in the first instance, from the magnificent promise made to Peter personally: "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven" (Matt., xvi. 19).

That which shuts the gate of heaven against us is sin alone; hence, to be given power to open this blessed gate, as well as the terrible alternative of keeping it shut, can only mean power either to forgive sin or to refuse to do so. This power is personal and positive and active, and its exercise is subject to the will of Peter. Subsequently a power fundamentally identical was communicated to the other Apostles on the evening of Easter Day: "'As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you.' When He had said this He breathed on them, and said to them: 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained'" (John, xx. 21-23).

These words, like those spoken to Peter, point to a real, personal and judicial power to forgive sins or to retain them. Surely Our Lord would not have acted with such solemnity and spoken in such positive unqualified terms, had He meant no more than that He has Himself taken away the sins of men, so that the sole duty of the Apostles and their successors consists in making an official statement or declaration that Christ has indeed cleansed us from sin. One of the canons of sound biblical interpretation is to take Our Lord's words in their literal, obvious sense, unless the context clearly shows that He is using words metaphorically. As a matter of fact, Our Lord does make use of a metaphor when He speaks of keys that open and shut, and of binding and loosing. But His language, although couched in metaphors, is nevertheless a constructive—I might say, a legal—pronouncement, and the Church has ever so understood it. Pius X, in his condemnation of modernism, condemned expressly its assertion that the words of John, xx. 21-23, do not refer to the Sacrament of Penance (cfr. Denzinger, n. 2047).

Our Lord prefaced His words to the Apostles by a very striking

preamble: "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you!" Thus, the mission of the Apostles is put on a level almost with that of the Redeemer Himself. Rightly so, too, for it is the glory of the Apostles and the honor of the Catholic priesthood that they took up, so to speak, Christ's redemptive work where He left off. Until the end of time the priests of the Church exercise the divine powers which He deigned to share with them, who in the hour of His Ascension declared that all power was His in heaven and in earth. St. Cyril of Alexandria's commentary on our text is very much to the point: "How does the Saviour give to His disciples a power which belongs exclusively to the Godhead (*viz.*, the power of forgiving sins)? . . . He judged that those to whom He gave the Holy Spirit should likewise forgive or retain sins. This they do in a twofold manner: when they summon to Baptism those who are worthy and keep from it the unworthy; or they forgive or retain sins in yet another way, when they rebuke the sinful children of the Church or grant pardon to those who are penitent."[1]

Christ sends or commissions His disciples in the same way as He Himself had been sent by the Father. Hence He obviously sends them forth for a like purpose. Now Christ came into the world for the sake of sinners: "A faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into this world to save sinners" (I Tim., i. 15). Repeatedly and with emphasis Jesus claimed power to forgive sin. "Be of good heart, son," He said to the sick man who had been let down through the roof and so set at His feet, "thy sins are forgiven thee." As was their wont, the Scribes murmured, although their opinion was perfectly correct when they said within themselves: "Who can forgive sins but God alone?" (Luke, v. 21). Jesus seized the opportunity to make a positive, if somewhat veiled, declaration of His divinity and to prove it by a resounding miracle: "That you may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (turning to the sick man He said to him): 'Arise, take up thy bed and go into thy house'" (Matt., ix. 6). We conclude that, if Christ sends forth His disciples even as He Himself had been sent forth by His Father, the power to forgive sins on earth wielded by Him is similarly exercised by those to whom He gave the Holy Ghost. As a matter of fact, the preaching of repentance and the forgiveness of sins are outstanding characteristics of the Apostles' and the Church's action in the world: "Thus it is written and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise again from the dead . . . and that penance and the remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all nations" (Luke, xxiv. 46, 47). St. Paul singles out this aspect of the Gospel in his address to the Areopagites of Athens. "God," he says, "having winked at the times

[1] Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, LXXIV, col. 721 A

of this ignorance, now declareth unto men that all should everywhere do penance" (Acts, xvii. 30). It would be wholly at variance with all we know of God if penance undertaken by man did not result in an effective blotting out of sin. And though the word "penance" seems to be used here in its widest and most comprehensive sense, the Sacrament is surely meant quite as much as the virtue.

Power to Forgive Sin Belongs to the Priesthood

The power of binding and loosing, of opening and shutting the gate of heaven, was given to the Apostles for the good of the Church. Hence it was not the exclusive prerogative of the Apostolic College and destined to expire as the Apostles disappeared one after another. As sin is the evil of all time, the power to remove it must last as long as there is need of its exercise. The mission of the Apostles is carried on by the priesthood, and will only terminate with the end of the world. The priests alone are the depositaries of the divine power of forgiveness, though, for the sake of humility or for easing one's conscience, one may reveal to another the burden of one's soul, according to the counsel of St. James: "Confess your sins to one another"—but there is no sacramental value in such an avowal. It may be a help, and the Apostle puts it on the same level as prayer, for he goes on to say: "and pray one for another that you may be saved" (James v. 16). The remission of sin is a judicial act; hence, in addition to the essential priestly power, the minister of this Sacrament requires the power of *jurisdiction*—that is, normally a priest can only validly absolve those souls of whom he has been given the cure and who are his subjects. Only in case of death may any priest absolve anyone, because in such an emergency the Church gives jurisdiction to all priests.

Confession

In this Sacrament there is not, properly speaking, any matter used or applied, such as water or oil are in other Sacraments. Hence the acts of the penitent are, *as it were,* the *matter* of the penance: namely, *confession, sorrow,* and *satisfaction.* The *form* is the words of absolution.

The Council of Trent strikes with anathema anyone who denies that sacramental confession is of divine institution and necessary to salvation, or who asserts that private confession as practised in the Church from the beginning is not based on Christ's command but is a mere human device (cfr. Denzinger, n. 916). The duty of full and detailed confession is evidently deduced from the words of the institution. Christ gave priests power to grant or to refuse forgiveness. This is nothing less than a participation of divine omnipotence, for none but God can forgive sin. Christ could and did forgive sin without

previous confession, for He, being omniscient, "knew all men": "He needed not that any should give testimony of man, for He knew what was in man" (John, ii. 24, 25). But the priest, though sharing Christ's omnipotence, has no share in His omniscence. Hence the sinner must make his guilt known so that the priest may judge whether or not he is a fit subject for divine pardon.

Though difficult, self-accusation answers to a deep instinct and a real need of the heart. It eases the soul, and is in itself an act of regret and reprobation of the evil deed. The very pagans felt this: "a god is nigh to those who confess," says Ovid (*Metamorph.*, x. 483). That the practice of confession is as old as Christianity may be seen in the simple fact that it is in general use today. History would certainly have retained the name of the man who would have imposed and enforced such an obligation. No mere man could have successfully foisted upon successive centuries a practice so humiliating to human pride. If there were not a divine warrant for it, the Church herself could not have obtained the ready compliance of her children in this matter.

Thoughtful Protestants are not unaware of the great loss to morality caused by the reformers' abolition of private confession. It was just such an experience that induced the city fathers of Nuremberg to appeal to Charles V that he would enforce afresh the practice of auricular confession as a remedy against the increase of crime that followed on the break with the past in this matter.

Harnack, who will not be suspected of partiality, confesses that the substitution of a general confession for a personal one, is "a strange and sad mistake," and he adds that efforts should be made to make grown-ups realize what a means of spiritual health they forego when everyone bears his own burden and refuses to open his heart to another. "In this respect may we not learn from the Catholic Church, and is it not criminal folly, because of some dead fruits, to root up the whole tree of confession?" (A. Harnack, "Reden und Aufsätze," II. p. 256).

In a letter to Passarge, Ibsen wrote on July 16, 1880: "All I have written is intimately related to my own life. . . . Every one of my works was meant to be a process of spiritual deliverance and cleansing."

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OUR READERS

Mechanical Confessions

Rev. Editors:

In the February issue of THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW (p. 469), I read: "Still others are too much engrossed with special devotions, with their hurried and profitless confessions but financially gainful." Again: "The increased number of confessions . . . has developed a tendency to incomplete, inaccurate and often mechanical confession of sin" (p. 471). Finally (p. 472): "The Jubilee pamphlets should stress the necessity of penance and the avoidance of sin." The Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Bellford, D.D., hit the nail right on the head. It may interest you to know that several years in succession I have made an official protest against those mechanical confessions; that since five or ten years I have strongly advocated missions in which the missionaries would spend their time in the confessional; less talk and display in the pulpit and much more searching of hearts for underlying dangers in the confessional; that I pointed out to my bishop more than once that nothing good but much harm comes from absolutions given at the rate of forty, fifty or more an hour to wilfully ignorant and not seldom stubborn people who come to confession once a year; that I have never invited the —— Fathers to conduct a Mission in my parish because they act in the confessional as if they presuppose that everybody without exception is well disposed and sincere. On the eve of a Confirmation in the parish of a good friend of mine, a priest with much experience to his credit in those parts asked me if I ever questioned the penitents. "Surely," I answered, "for not a few need it; at times they are hard-boiled and their dispositions are so doubtful." "I never do," he replied, "for the more one tries to teach them, the more stubborn they become; moreover, they are apt to completely misunderstand and cause trouble without end." "Very true," I said. "Still we must admit that confessions as made out here are rather a farce."

(Rev.) A. VERHOEVEN.

Book Reviews

MISCELLANEA

The near future will bring much discussion of social and economic problems. No longer will the general aspects of the social question be debated, but attention will be focused on technical points. Thus, for example, such an abstruse matter as the monetary system will be injected into the controversy. More than ever even the proverbial man of the street must extend his information on matters economic and social if he wishes to follow developments in an intelligent manner. In our days hardly anybody can escape the necessity of seriously studying the science of economics, if science it is.

Father Fallon has written a text on economics for colleges which has been translated into English.[1] Considering the intricate nature of the subject-matter, the text is exceptionally clear, and hence will prove helpful to the non-professional reader. The translators have adapted the book to the particular needs of our own country, and have added in an Appendix the statement of the American Hierarchy on the present industrial crisis. At times the English translation might be a little less stilted. To mention only one instance, Plutology could have been very easily rendered by the familiar "science of wealth."

The book will be serviceable as a college text, but will also be very useful in conducting study circles and for general reading. Needless to say, it is thoroughly imbued with the Catholic spirit and follows the lead of the great papal Encyclicals.

In the preface to his little volume on "Charity," the Most Rev. Hamlet John Cicognani, the present Apostolic Delegate, remarks: "To go back to the ancient is to go forward." With proper limitations this may be well applied to educational matters. Indeed, we can learn much from the old educators. Had we faithfully walked in their footsteps, many of the educational blunders of our own days would have been avoided. For this reason we are glad that a translation of the famous *Ratio Studiorum* of the Jesuits has appeared.[2] The translation of the famous document, though far from being elegant, is readable. In extenuation of the indifferent translation we might argue with Chesterton that, "if a thing is worth doing, it is worth doing badly." Reading the *Ratio,* we understand the secret of the universal success of Jesuit education. An enormous amount of practical pedagogical wisdom is contained in these pages.

---

[1] *Principles of Social Economy.* By Valere Fallon, S.J. Translated by Rev. John L. McNulty, Ph.D., and Bert C. Goss, A.M., D.C.S. (Benziger Brothers, New York City).

[2] *St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum.* Edited by Edward A. Fitzpatrick. Translations by Mary Helen Mayer and A. R. Ball (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York City).

It is not necessarily the bulky tome that contains most. This comes home to us very forcibly as we read Shane Leslie's brief and vivid description of the Oxford Movement.[3] The author is full of his subject and handles it with sovereign knowledge of detail. Thus, he is able to pick out the relevant and discard what would merely fill space without adding anything really pertinent. It is true that to appreciate the work fully a little preliminary knowledge of the subject would be desirable. Still, the excellent sketch gives a comprehensive survey and certainly will whet the reader's appetite for more. The pages sparkle with shrewd epigrams which the author scatters like brilliant gems. Characters and situations are delineated with a few bold and artistic strokes. The brilliancy of the narrative makes us overlook an occasional lack of theological precision. Very interesting are the Appendices in which the influence of the Movement on literature and architecture is outlined.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

[3] *The Oxford Movement 1833—1933.* By Shane Leslie (The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wis.).

"CAVALIER"

A volume bearing the simple title of "Cavalier"[1] might easily suggest to readers either a purely fictional romance or what has been styled an "historical novel." The volume under review explains its brief title satisfactorily, but readers might also easily suspect that they shall find in it merely a collection of edited letters of much interest to a family and its friends (such, for instance, as the "Letters of John Holmes to James Russell Lowell and Others" issued under the auspices of the Cambridge Historical Society—a book of 340 pages wearisome even to a lover of Lowell's prose and verse and of interest only to a local Historical Society). In the present case, however, readers would be very wide of the mark in such a judgment passed on the letters of William Blundell edited by a wholly competent person bearing the same family name as the writer of the letters. For here we have in reality an authentic and glowing romance of Catholicity under the terrible stress of a most gruelling and long-protracted persecution. The past becomes thus vividly present to us. We are no longer reading the accounts given by historians, whether in summary outline or in such widely diffused—albeit most abundant—detail as to leave, on the whole, a vague impression on the mind of a reader. We are now following the fortunes (say rather, the misfortunes) of a single hero throughout a long lifetime lived with gallant aplomb under highly varied conditions of anti-Catholic measures (royal or parliamentary) that

[1] *Cavalier: Letters of William Blundell to His Friends.* Edited by Margaret Blundell. With frontispiece (Longmans, Green and Co., New York City).

constituted a slow martyrdom for a faithful Catholic gentleman who meanwhile was loyal to his country as well as to his Faith.

William Blundell was born on July 15, 1620, and died on May 24, 1698, having very nearly completed seventy-eight years of life. He thus lived through the reigns of Charles I, the Commonwealth interregnum, Charles II and James II, and nearly throughout the reign of William and Mary. "To understand his story it is needful to view him through the eye of the law of his day as the heir to papists." Thus, we see him the heir to but a third part of his ancestors' estate, the other two-thirds being forfeited to the Crown in lieu of fines of 20 pounds a month for non-attendance at the services of the Protestant church; it is a criminal offense, subject to severe penalties, for him to receive a Catholic education; the priests of his own religion are outlaws, compelled to baptize, instruct, marry, and bury the members of their flock in secret. The world waits at his doors ready to make merry with him should he "conform"; if he persists in practising the old Faith, he stands (to quote his own words applied to his son) "condemned, like his father before him, to the plough and share." Thus the editor, noting his birth, notes also his heirloom of fines and confiscations by the State (pp. 2-3). Born thus into the race of life under continuous handicaps in respect of faith, fortune and education, he clung with almost terrifying constancy to his Catholic beliefs, endured patiently the falling away and final annihilation of his fortune, and meanwhile made himself a fairly learned man for his time. His letters exhibit him as a man who possessed not alone moral and physical courage of the highest type but withal a spirit of calm humor that must have helped him wondrously to sustain the manifold burdens of "so long life," as Hamlet dispiritedly remarks when contemplating his own conjectural "self-slaughter." He suffered not only fines and ostracism for his Faith, but was wounded in battle for his king. Twice he suffered imprisonment.

The volume is of such interesting quality throughout that a reviewer is often tempted to quote some of the romantic happenings recorded or indicated in the letters. History is at its best when viewed with the eyes of such a cavalier as William Blundell and commented upon with the pen of such a competent editor as Margaret Blundell, who furnishes the volume with a bibliographical Foreword and prefatory Note, with ten Appendices and an Index of sixteen closely printed columns.

The title of the volume, "Cavalier," suggests its contrasting word, "Roundhead." It also suggests the association of both words by James Russell Lowell in his *Commemoration Ode* for the soldiers of the North who died in our own Civil War. Was any one of these more

valiant, whether in war or in peace, than our Catholic Cavalier, William Blundell?

Who now shall sneer?
Who dare again to say we trace
Our lines to a plebeian race?
Roundhead and Cavalier!
Dumb are those names erewhile in battle loud;
Dream-footed as the shadow of a cloud
They flit across the ear:
That is best blood that hath most iron in't,
To edge resolve with, pouring without stint
For what makes manhood dear.

"What makes manhood dear"—for that did our Cavalier, William Blundell, pour all that he had without stint, and merrily withal as well as courageously. His name, at any rate, will no longer flit across the ear "dream-footed as the shadow of a cloud."

H. T. Henry, Litt.D.

A COLLEGE COURSE IN RELIGION

Catholic colleges throughout the land will make no mistake in giving more than a cursory examination to the Science and Culture texts for college religion recently published by the Bruce Publishing Company. Nothing so good has come within this reviewer's ken since the appearance of Cooper's "Religion Outlines for Colleges." The new series is a complete cycle of Christian doctrine and practice with vital application throughout to modern times. It embodies the desires, aspirations, and ideals of representative groups of college teachers of religion from various parts of the United States.

The first volume of the new series is the work of Father Lord, nationally known editor of *The Queen's Work*.[1] It has that freshness and originality which we have become accustomed to expect of anything from the pen of Father Lord. The author has been connected for some time with the Students' Spiritual Leadership Movement, and the valuable experience he has garnered in this field is abundantly reflected in his latest book. Father Lord lays particular stress upon the qualities expected in the Catholic student, because he sees in the latter the leader in the cause of Catholic Action tomorrow.

"Religion and Leadership," as a text, is distinctly collegiate in character. It may be best described as an orientation course in religion, presenting a survey of Catholic doctrine and practice admirably suited for use in the freshman college year. As such, it gives no comprehen-

[1] *Religion and Leadership*. By the Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S.J. (The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.).

sive treatment of the subjects it contains. Rather does it outline for the student viewpoints, standards, bases and fundamentals which are more fully developed as the college courses in religion, philosophy, history, science and literature proceed.

The second volume of the series is from the pen of Father Bakewell Morrison, S.J., A.M., Director of the Department of Religion, St. Louis University.[2] In the reviewer's opinion, it is the best college text of Apologetics now in the field. "The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind" is no thinly disguised translation, nor watered-down adaptation, of some Latin text written for seminarians. The book is expressly designed to help the Catholic sophomore student to understand the "modern mind," to answer its objections against his Faith, and to meet intelligently the religious issues of his day. Much space is justly devoted to the opponents of religion, but in all this there is no beating of dead dogs. The Catholic student meets therein those actual "moderns" who angle deliberately for the youthful mind.

The book begins with a canvass of the religious situation as it exists in theory and practice today in the United States. Next come the preambles of Faith. The chapter on miracles is a gem. Much space is deservedly given to Le Bec's clinical study of the Pierre de Rudder miracle, because it gives definite scientific data with which to solve the problem of "unknown forces." The chapter on the Gospels takes into account the latest archeological findings bearing upon the trustworthiness of the New Testament. The book concludes with the proofs of the divinity of Christ and of the fact that He founded a Church.

Father Gerald Ellard, S.J., Ph.D., professor of liturgy in the St. Louis University School of Divinity, is the author of the third volume of this series.[3] "Christian Life and Worship" is perhaps the first general textbook for collegiate use in the field of liturgical studies. The publishers were wise indeed in entrusting its writing to Father Ellard. He is not only an expert in liturgy but has also been for years in contact with the Liturgical Movement both in Europe and in the United States. He has served as associate editor of *Orate Fratres* since the date of its first issue.

The matter and arrangement of Father Ellard's book are on a distinctly collegiate basis. This by no means detracts from the utility of the work for the general reader. The author's scholarship is everywhere in evidence, but the style of writing is in a truly popular vein. One is safe in predicting that Father Ellard's book will meet with an enthusiastic reception from the general Catholic public.

It is hard to praise "Christian Life and Worship" in measured

[2] *The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind.* By the Rev. Bakewell Morrison, S.J., A.M.

[3] *Christian Life and Worship.* By the Rev. Gerald Ellard, S.J., Ph.D.

terms. One is easily carried away with enthusiasm for the work. Like Karl Adam, the author is convinced that dogma is the very structure of Christian life, and that recognition of this fact is the thing most vitally needed to secure popular support of the Liturgical Movement. Father Ellard's book is built upon the fundamental truth of Christ's Mystical Body, the doctrine most capable today of supplying a complete synthesis of the social implications of Christianity. The Mystical Body of Christ, as studied in the corporate worship of the Church, is a living system of social sanctification. May it not be the dynamic that will hasten the solution of the natural antagonism between the individual and society?

Father Ellard traces the beautiful history of the Mass from primitive Christianity to the present time, and shows how wonderfully the Mass has through the centuries met man's need for corporate worship. We need today a return to the sacrificial-mindedness of the first Christians. So many of our people are mere spectators at the Holy Sacrifice, and their attitude all too frequently is one of bored fulfillment of their weekly obligations as Catholics. Father Ellard's book, if circulated generally, should do much to transform this lethargy into an intelligent, even an enthusiastic, participation in the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

CARL P. HENSLER, D.D.

ECTOPIC OPERATIONS

In a compact, well-written, neatly printed, well indexed, copiously annotated and illustrated volume, Fr. Bouscaren, S.J., embodies an exhaustive study of a much mooted problem.[1] The work is patently the result of profound thought and untiring research on the part of a scholar fully qualified for the task. He begins his treatise with a history of abortion. Then he proceeds to lead the reader through a mass of pertinent materials, doctrines, decrees, ethical opinions, false solutions, *materia medica,* and whatever may seem to bear even remotely upon the subject. Withal, he has organized an array of sources and facts that should satisfy the most exacting mind.

His "Moral Arguments and Conclusions" are reserved for the last chapter. Concerning these there will undoubtedly arise wide diversity of opinion. His arguments are sometimes difficult to follow. Such, for example, is that applied to sustain the first proposition of his thesis: "The removal of a pregnant fallopian tube containing a non-viable living fetus, even before the external rupture of the tube, can be done in such a way that the consequent death of the fetus will be produced

[1] *Ethics of Ectopic Operations.* By Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., S.T.D., Mag. Agg. Professor of Canon Law, St. Mary-of-the-Lake Seminary, Mundelein, Illinois (Loyola University Press, Chicago).

only indirectly." In this relation, he describes two surgical procedures, both directed towards the same end, one of which is licit while the other is illicit.

The main arguments are based upon what the author designates "the subtle principle of the double effect" (p. 51) and "the principle of the proportionate cause" (p. 166)—the latter of which, he explains, is a requisite condition for the application of the former. These "principles" and the consequent arguments are—*mirabile dictu!*—derived from the Angelic Doctor's article on self-defense against an unjust aggressor (*"Utrum licet alicui occidere aliquem, se defendendo,"* "Summa. Theol.," II-II, Q. lxiv., art. 3). Nevertheless, the author asserts decisively that the ectopic fetus is not an aggressor, just or unjust. Were it not for this "circumstance," the average reader might accept his conclusions unconditionally.

The conclusions, which Father Bouscaren summarizes under ten numerals, substantially conform with the prevailing therapeutic practice. Throughout he is concerned for the mother's life with little thought for the ectopic child save that it be baptized. For example. "the excision of an unruptured pregnant tube containing a non-viable fetus, done for the purpose of saving the mother's life, is not a direct, but an indirect abortion."

It is doubtful, therefore, whether the harassed pastor and the conscientious physician will find practical guidance in this otherwise excellent work. Perchance they may even be confused when they read: "In view of the fact that the chances of the fetus to survive to viability if the operation is deferred, are extremely meagre in the ordinary unruptured case of ectopic pregnancy, it would seem that a *notably greater probability of saving the mother's life* by the present (immediate) excision of the tube would constitute a proportionately grave reason for the operation" (pp. 168-9).

RODERICK MACEACHEN.

The HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIV

Numbers 1-6

OCTOBER, 1933, TO MARCH, 1934

PASTORALIA

By Charles Bruehl, D.D.

HOMILETIC SERIES

By the Right Rev. Msgr. H. T. Henry, Litt.D

PRACTICAL ASCETICAL NOTES FOR PRIESTS

By Bede Jarrett, O.P.

TOWARDS LOVING THE PSALMS

By C. C. Martindale, S.J., M.A.

MISCELLANEOUS CONTRIBUTIONS

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OUR READERS

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

By Stanislaus Woywod, O.F.M., LL.B.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

SERMONS FOR SUNDAYS AND FEASTS

HOMILIES FOR SUNDAYS AND FEASTS

By Ernest Graf, O.S.B.

BOOK REVIEWS